



# DOUAY OR NEW YORK, WHICH?

OR,

REASON, REVELATION, AND RESPON-  
SIBILITY COORDINATE.

BY

REV. F. M. EDWARDS,

*Of the Virginia Conference, M. E. Church, South.*

---

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.  
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH.  
SMITH & LAMAR, AGENTS.  
1907.



## CONTENTS.

---

CHAPTER I.	
	PAGE
SEEKING THE TRUTH... ..	5
CHAPTER II.	
THE WORDS OF CHRIST OUR GUIDE.....	52
CHAPTER III.	
JEHOVAH'S MODE OF REVELATION .....	59
CHAPTER IV.	
CREDIBILITY OF HISTORY GIVEN.....	65
CHAPTER V	
THE RHEIMS-DOUAY VERSION.....	77
CHAPTER VI.	
THE AMERICAN REVISED VERSION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE..	105
CHAPTER VII.	
RESPONSIBILITY .....	113
CHAPTER VIII.	
RECAPITULATION .....	135
APPENDIX .....	177



# Douay or New York, Which?

---

## CHAPTER I.

### SEEKING THE TRUTH.

COMMON sense is the best sense, if by it we mean "practical understanding or the capacity to see and take things in their right light." The average man has this faculty, and to it an appeal should be made for the ascertainment of such actualities as are needed to be known by those who must "give account" in the great beyond. This power of the human mind that we call "common sense" is undoubtedly equal to the duty imposed upon it, of knowing some things that do not at the first mention of them appear very plain. Acquired knowledge is as certain as any other, provided the acquisition thereof be by a course of thought that admits no deception. Even discoveries that originally required more than an ordinary genius, when once demonstrated, become perfectly clear to the multitude.

The mind that first thought out the great demonstration of the proposition "that the square described on the longest side of a right-angled triangle is equal to the sum of the squares of the other two sides" evidently possessed remarkable talent; but after his demonstrative work he was as sure as to the truth of the assertion as he was sure of the axiom, "Things

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

equal to the same thing are equal to each other." Still further it may be said that mathematicians of far less genius than the original discoverer have all through the history of mathematics felt in the same way; nor can we deny that mechanics who might be unable to go through the proof as given in geometry are positively certain that when they apply the rule called "six, eight, and ten" to the corner of the house frame there will be the angle of a square at the junction of the sills. Why is this? The learned man will reply by referring to the proposition aforesaid, and say: "The square of six is thirty-six, and the square of eight is sixty-four; sixty-four added to thirty-six makes one hundred, which number is the square of ten; therefore the angle opposite the ten feet side must be a right angle." The mechanic may say: "It has been tried thousands of times, and hence it is known to be true that when six feet are measured on one sill and eight feet are measured on the other, and then the sills be so joined at the ends that a line ten feet long will exactly reach from the point marked eight to the point marked six, the corner formed will be square." The knowledge of each is acquired, but no one doubts the certainty of it.

On this doctrine relative to acquired knowledge the investigators of natural science (as well as the mathematicians above named) proceed. From things known to things unknown the road is one of inquiry, and the seeker of truth tries to be perfectly sure as to each step of progress, that it is in the right direction. As the student of geometry starts with axioms (known truths or intuitions) and proceeds to the solution of

## *Seeking the Truth.*

the most difficult problems in the task of measurement, so the student of the outer world must take truths known by perceptive experiences and go onward to discoveries in the beyond, all the time taking great care that no link in the chain of logic is defective and no fact of perception misunderstood. The physical senses (sight, smell, hearing, taste, and touch) must receive due attention as channels of sense perception, and all the varied ways by which "illusion" may cause deception must be duly guarded.

The properties of the understanding mind must be studied and appreciated. When all this is done, surely there is certainty of the knowledge acquired by perception, as there is certainty in the assertion that "two and two make four."

The truth seeker here has no necessity to think that he is unable to know that he saw a farmer planting corn (because the sensation produced on the organ of vision might possibly have been an optical illusion), nor will he doubt on the ground that philosophers assert the impossibility of knowing more than appearances, while "things in themselves" must remain unknown. The "phenomenon" appearance, and the "noumenon" thing in itself, as talked of by Immanuel Kant, will hardly perplex the searcher after facts of experience. If there should be any need of extra care in the ascertainment of what the farmer was placing in the ground, or if the observer desired to have further evidence than that of sight as to the man or the grain, he might easily bring the corroborative testimony of touch and hearing; but when the individual can say, "The eye has seen and the



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

hand has handled the material of the man and the grain, and the ear has heard the voice of the man and the rattling of the grain," it would be impossible to convince that person that he was ignorant of what he asserted as to the fact. No judge or jury could or would demand testimony from the other two physical senses. Though all this is plain enough to "common sense," it may yet be added that when a large number of sight-seers and handlers gave the same assertion as to the act spoken of, certainty of fact is rendered complete.

That illusions of sense perception have marked human history cannot be denied. Cæsar, in his celebrated history of the Gallic War, tells of a man who brought to him a report of having seen certain things in regard to the enemies' forces, but after investigation the writer placed upon the historic page the assertion that this man had told "what he did not see for what he did see." Stories of ghosts and hobgoblins have belonged to many classes of human beings, and no doubt some of them honestly believed. From toilers in science the student has learned how bunches of luscious grapes seemed to be before the eyes; but when the hand was put forth to grasp the tempting fruit, its possessor found nothing to reward his exertion. Two quotations from men of thought may here be appropriately given. They are taken from the Standard Dictionary: "The judgment of many excellent persons is liable to be infected by illusions of the imagination." (H. Butterworth, "Journeys in Northern Lands," Chapter III., p. 49.) "We may thus roughly define an illusion of perception as con-

## *Seeking the Truth.*

sisting in the formation of a quasi percept which is peculiar to an individual or which is contradicted by another and presumably more accurate percept." (Sully, "Illusions," Chapter III., p. 38.)

It is very clear that the searcher after realities in Nature's arcana must be ever watchful against two possible sources of error: the first is mistaking an appearance, the second is false reasoning as to a true appearance. The man who would declare himself willing to make an oath that he saw real ships, masts downward, sailing in the heavens where he had only witnessed "a mirage" would give an illustration of the first danger; but the second danger may be argued from the example of the supposed reasoner who would deny that any such appearance as that called "a mirage" was ever witnessed, because all the ships he himself ever saw were real. Each of the two gentlemen should have known something of the laws of light before making positive assertions of the kind named. The testimony of more than one of the physical senses added to the declaration of multitudes of persons possessing similar physical powers must convince the observer of certainty as to fact. No one would or could suppose that Napoleon Bonaparte when he fled from the bloody field of Waterloo had any doubt of the terrible character of the day's experience. Equally certain must that renowned Frenchman afterwards have been of the vast ocean whose waters surrounded his prison island, St. Helena.

The student of nature certainly acknowledges the possibility of error in the use of sense preception; but

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

he as certainly knows that there is a limit somewhere to such possibility, and hence, having reached a convincing amount of observation or experiment, he confidently makes the assertion: "I cannot be mistaken as to the fact or truth learned." Should the metaphysical reasoner come to such a person and talk eloquently of the small capability of the human mind; should the astronomer declare that no claim can be made to a knowledge of the sun and the planets, as only appearances (phenomena) had come to the eye of the stargazer; should the equally honest and true philosopher assert that no "thing in itself" had ever been seen or known and the truth was clear that such a "thing" could never be known—the unsophisticated, common-sense searcher after facts would, with positive assurance, reply somewhat as follows—viz.: "Admitting that 'the thing itself' cannot do more than give its image or appearance [phenomenon] to my perceptive faculties, I know that my understanding, my common sense is within and assures me that a real thing must be in existence when I receive the appearances thereof through such trustworthy channels. There would be no picture of the farmer on the expansion of my optic nerve were there no farmer within the range of my vision, and the fact that the rays of light entering my eye give the true locality of the said farmer is assured by the touch and by the sense of hearing, as well as by personal witnesses having the same pictures on their optic nerves. The possibility of illusion by mirrors is excluded (by these undoubted witnesses) because there are no mirrors near; the course of the rays is direct, no refraction or reflec-

## *Seeking the Truth.*

tion is possible. Hence I *know* that the farmer was planting corn."

By thoughts similar to those pointed out in the preceding lines man becomes as certain of facts observed as the geometer is certain of the first proposition founded upon the axiom "the whole is equal to all its parts." He has only to be careful as to the character of his observation. It must be honestly made for the purpose of securing a knowledge of facts. Dr. W. Stanley Jevon (in "Logic," p. 201) says: "All knowledge, it may be safely said, must be ultimately founded upon experience, which is but a general name for the various feelings impressed upon the mind at any period of its existence. The mind never creates entirely new knowledge independent of experience, and all that the reasoning power can do is to arrive at the full meaning of the facts which are in our possession." Farther on in the same book may be found the following words of caution: "Nothing is more important in observation and experiment than to be uninfluenced by any prejudice or theory in correctly recording the facts observed and allowing to them their proper weight. He who does not do so will almost always be able to obtain facts in support of an opinion however erroneous."

Now fully cautioned as to possible error, but as fully assured as to the amount of perceptive action necessary to reach certainty as to reality in observation, the truth seeker investigates the motive and the process of corn-planting. He learns from the farmer that his object in apparently throwing away grains of corn is to have a much larger number of grains pro-

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

duced in the course of a few months, and he expects each grain of "the crop" to be exactly like the grain buried in the ground. Reflecting upon this wonderful matter of reproduction, the investigator leaves the farmer at his work; but after about two weeks he returns and discovers that during his absence much work has been accomplished, not by the farmer but by a mysterious action or movement in the soil. From each grain planted has proceeded a little screwlike sprout which in some cases has already developed into little blades of fodder. Desiring to know something of the workshop concealed underground, the observer digs up several "hills" of corn, and finds another sprout (of an entirely different disposition from the one reaching the upper air) attached to each grain. He learns from other investigators that the names agreed upon for these sprouts are "the plumule" and "the caulicle." The one seeks the upper air and sunlight; the other, satisfied with less air and light, works in comparative darkness. The one seems to seek materials floating in the atmosphere, the other equally eager to gather food from the soil; both show the same design of activity, that of building a cornstalk and hanging thereon an "ear" of corn. Neither can do the work of the other; but neither can work without the coöperative work of the other. No amount of manipulation on the part of the farmer can make the plumule live and work under ground; nor can the caulicle be induced to perform its functions outside of the soil. There is an apparent stubbornness here, absolutely unconquerable by any artifice of man. Each worker in its own way will bring its contribu-

## *Seeking the Truth.*

tion to the ultimate result; and the two contributions meeting in the appointed place will afford the scientific botanist and agricultural chemist a field of study as interesting as astonishing.

But now our observer, leaving the cornfield to go to a professional chemist for testing the laws of affinity and the formation of chemical compounds, reaches percepts or truths which, while they astonish and perplex him, must whet his appetite for further knowledge as to the plant growth in the field he was erewhile watching. After a sufficient time he returns to the field, and there his eyes are greeted with an extended and enchanting view as instructive to him as joyous to the farmer. The plumule and caulicle have accomplished a wonderful transformation. Blades from the former and roots from the latter are discoverable engaged in coöperative and industrious exertion to support a rapidly growing fruitage. Coming to an examination of the stalks one by one, the student finds at angles made by the jointure of blades and stalks, appearances are seen which the farmer calls "shoots." Some of these have already sent forth beautifully colored "silks," while all are expected to do the same; also at the summit of each stalk has appeared what the farmer calls a "tassel," very important in the fertilization of the shoots at the angles where the "roasting ears" are soon to appear. The very mysterious communication of a fertilizer from tassel to silk, and the resulting formation of cob and grains, must be an example of the employment of even the mildest zephyr breezes to contribute to the

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

purpose of the work in which roots and blades are engaged.

At the approach of the end of summer the silks become dry, as do the tassels, the milky "roasting ears" have reached a hardened condition, and soon the farmer, having pulled the fodder for cattle food, begins to gather the corn ears for human food as well as that for the horses and hogs he has to feed. The cornstalk and its roots have accomplished their task; they have delivered up what was valuable; life is gone, activity has ceased; "No sound can awaken the stalk or root to glory again."

Our observer, now coming to investigate what product the farmer has stored in his "corncrib," asks if the grains are exactly like those planted in the springtime. An affirmative reply is received; but the inquisitive mind determines upon a chemical analysis, calling up the information that he had gained on the visit to the laboratory while the corn was growing. Now upon subjecting each grain to the most careful dissection and each part to the most certain chemical tests, the reproduction of corn grains is thoroughly established. The chemist performs his experiments in full view of the gazer and points out the exact amount of starch, proteids, ash, and other ingredients seen and handled from each crop, the old and the new. He learns what is meant by an "embryo" as "the rudimentary plant within the seed which makes its appearance soon after the fertilization of the ovule by the pollen." He accords truth to Asa Gray ("Field Book of Botany") when he says: "The youngest seedling, and even the embryo in the seed, is already an epitome

## *Seeking the Truth.*

of the herb or tree." Verily he learns enough to know that there is obedience to the law of seeds to produce each after its kind. A grain of corn will not produce an apple.

This further information is gained by the visit to the analytic chemist—viz., that each of the parts (as starch, etc.) of the seed corn is a compound. Starch is composed of carbon, hydrogen, and oxygen, in fixed proportions ( $C_6H_{10}O_5$ ). The proteids are composed of carbon, hydrogen, oxygen, nitrogen, and sulphur; and in reference to them it is said (after varied and convincing experiments): "The proteids are the most important animal and vegetable compounds, and none of the phenomena of life occur without their presence. They possess common chemical reactions, and are united by close genetic relationship."

The chemist explains the difference between "molecules" and "atoms," and shows how each molecule of starch has as many as twenty-one atoms ( $6+10+5$ ). Hence the rational power of the student by compulsion reaches the conclusion that chemical work has been performed throughout this remarkable journey of elements from the roots underground to the varied deposits, each deposit in its appropriate place to form a seed suited for planting the next spring. The molecules of starch made in this journey are to form the bulky part of the grain, while the other compounds are to concentrate in that part which the farmer calls the "heart;" and in this heart is to be that peculiar and delicate placement of requisites for a "germ" that is to be quickened into vegetative life for the sprouting, etc.



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

The next step taken in the search for truth may be in visiting the forest in the same neighborhood. Here under large oak trees are found acorns, valuable as food for swine. In one place is seen a little oak having only three or four leaves. Examination of the roots reveals the plan of sprouting similar to that observed in the corn crop. The plumule has sought the upper air, the caulicle has sent rootlets into the soil. If the truth seeker will employ the closest scrutiny during the growth of an oak tree, he will find the same great factors which he observed in corn production here engaged in the making of a structure from which acorns are to be the fruit.

The leaves of the tree gather carbonic acid from the atmosphere, appropriating the carbon to the building of woody fiber, while the oxygen is sent back to the air to supply man and beast with vital breath. The roots go in every direction in the soil to become channels for the conveyance of ingredients needed to produce what shall afterwards be found in ashes. The whole machinery evidently has the twofold design of securing timber for man's use and acorns for seed from which to grow future trees.

A very remarkable discovery is at this point made by the deeply interested observer. He finds that the little oak refuses to follow the cornstalk in the cessation of vegetative life at the approach of frost. It drops its leaves, but in its roots and trunk retains vitality for giving forth new leaves in the springtime. It is called a perennial, not an annual, plant.

Now let the investigator examine all the seeds he can possibly secure and gather all information to be

## *Seeking the Truth.*

had from farmers, gardeners, and foresters, and he will surely be able to state an invariable law of the vegetable world, to the effect that root sprouts (caulicles) seek the soil that has the ingredients designed for transit by root carriage to growing plants; while the upward sproutings (plumules) refuse to go downward, but seek air and light by means of which they are to contribute to the same great end, that of building a vegetable structure. It will also be discovered that the two agencies, the plumule and the caulicle, work in the utmost harmony, and their contributions meet in the appropriate place and are formulated into the various parts of woody fiber or fruits or flowers.

The worker in this vast field of investigation may be startled but not alarmed when he is brought to the task of considering the number of seeds in any one variety and the number of varieties found in the make-up of the croppage from the earth's crust. He sees design in the result before his eyes. Not a supply for planting alone is secured, but a vast amount of food for men and animals is taken in the round of vegetable activity. Only a comparatively small number of corn or wheat grains will go back to the soil. The burdened ships of commerce may be summoned as evidence of this fact. The number of grass seeds given to the singing birds in this wonderful circuit will given an idea of the wisdom found in the known truth that one seed will render hundreds if not thousands in reproduction. Nor will our thoughtful student of Nature's workshop stop here. He thinks of the vast number of varieties of seeds and learns that

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

many of these varieties are not contributors to the supply of food to the eater, but live and die seemingly for a very different purpose. The display of beauty seems to be the object of their existence. The eye of man is gratified by this display; and hence the line, "The earth is flecked with flowers many-tinted, fresh and gay," is not void of its philosophy. In the Botanical Garden of the Agricultural College where this is written there are largely over two thousand varieties of plants which may be classed as beautifiers. The incidental feeding of bees and other specimens of life will by no means detract from the wisdom of the arrangement. As beauty is seen as an incident in those growths whose main object seems to be the production of food, so here the incidental giving of a repast to the sucking bee may not detract from the great object of beauty for the eye.

Our observant friend, having gone thus far in his search without taking any appearance as fact until verified by evidence that called for certainty, proceeds to some elevated position from which he can view an extended landscape. Here he is forced to the conclusion that all vegetation has two objects in view—viz., the support of animal life and the giving of comfort and gratification during that life. The cultivated and the uncultivated patches before him in their unmistakable teaching show oneness of design as belonging to all the processes that have been subjected to thoughtful examination. Fruits, flowers, wood, resulting in food, beauty, and prospective houses and firesides, can make no other impression upon the mind

## *Seeking the Truth.*

than that of adaptation to the ends mentioned. The picture afforded by the landscape is indeed beautiful to behold; but the utility of its parts can scarcely fail to cause the thinker to refer to the minutiae of the varied activity that he has studied from the seed in the soil to the blooming flowers and ripening fruits for man's advantage, all contributors to the grand result.

In the study of the picture thus presented to the human eye, the questions will very naturally arise: How much of the production was under the authority of the beneficiaries? How much can man do in the work of his own support? The farmer was credited with choosing to plant, to plow and hoe, and in the season therefor he chose to gather the corn; but all the process of growth was beyond his control. Nor could he by the aid of all the chemists in the laboratories of the world reproduce a grain of corn sufficiently vital to germinate, after the process of analysis. The chemist must say: "I can take to pieces, but I am unable to replace the parts. Analysis is mine, but synthesis is beyond my skill." Life (even vegetable life) is from a power higher than that of an earthly laborer.

The truth here presented is as solemn as it is instructive. If all the grains of corn on this globe were in a day robbed of their germs, nothing less than the original Creator could supply seed corn for the next season. The chemist might put together the exact proportions of the elements found in the heart of the grain and surround the whole with starch in the exact quantity he had observed, but the parts would refuse

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

to do the work of vegetable life. It is equally true that if the twig or limb of a tree be cut off from the source of vitality death must ensue; and once dead, the twig cannot be made to go onward with the process of life by any human skill.

If the farmer before mentioned had seen a brother farmer with a bucket of corn meal or a basket of "rat-eaten" corn designing to put either or both in the soil with the expectation of securing sprouts, corn-stalks, and ears of corn therefrom, and this planter should give as the reason for his conduct that he had learned from chemical analysis that all the elements of seed corn were in the materials he was placing in the soil, the prospect of one more unfortunate human being receiving an invitation to the insane asylum would be very apparent. Our common sense thinker seems necessarily compelled to adopt the idea that vitality in the vegetative circuit, beginning with the sprouting of the seed and going on to the consummation of a crop for animal food, must have come from a designing power greater than that known to belong to any inhabitant of the earth. Man may be said to make a rake, a hoe, a plow, from the material in his reach; but he can never be named as the manufacturer of the heart of a seed or of the life current in a tree.

Proceeding now to what is called the animal kingdom, our searcher finds that the number and complexity of varieties in living organisms must bewilder or defy the thought of individual examination; but fortunately for him, there are two positively

## *Seeking the Truth.*

known facts that may give sufficient information to enable him to speak with certainty as to knowledge. The one fact is that, in obedience to the principle of division of labor, multitudes of investigative toilers have taken different departments of this great field (many of them devoting special activity for a life work), so that zoölogy has become a science with about fourteen departments, such as ornithology (birds), herpetology (reptiles), ichthyology (fishes), etc.; and the facts brought out by these scientists have been so demonstrated that knowledge of even microscopic beings has become public property. The second truth to which reference was made above is that our student can by personal observation for a short time obtain from the meat market, and from farm as well as street, animal activity enough of certainty to satisfy the mind as to an argument.

Giving entire credence to the facts discovered by scientific toilers (because their statements have so many witnesses to establish their truth), our investigator selects for special examination a specimen of animal product that he can study without the aid of a microscope, and one meeting the constant gaze of men. He takes an egg of the barnyard fowl and studies and wonders, and wonders and studies. An outer coating made of carbonate of lime seems to afford protection to the softer materials. Within the shell is found a layer of albumen, a substance exactly similar to that found in the human cranium, and called brain matter. Farther toward the center is seen the yolk, of a rich yellow color and containing as component elements phosphates, sulphates, etc.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

In addition to these known things found in an egg\* (which things can be brought to a chemical test), there is a germ, or prospective vitality, without which no chicken birth can be secured. As was seen in the case of seeds, this possible vitality can be made active only by certain conditions in this case of warmth, such as the "sitting hen" affords. It is also discovered that here (as in seeds) analysis may be in the chemist's power, but synthesis never. There is no human skill that can manufacture an egg. Even the placing of the identical ingredients back in the same shell from which they were taken will not make an egg that will "hatch." The Life Giver must do his own work in the germ factory. The delicate and mysterious placement of materials must be made by a wisdom unattainable by man; and it is equally true that the subsequent life current in the living chicken cannot be produced by any less power. Man can kill a chicken, but he cannot cause that chicken to live

---

\*The analysis of the yolk as given by chemists is about as follows—viz.:

Water .....	41.486
Vitelline (a form of albumen) ..	15.76
Margerine and oleine (named from resemblance to pearl) .....	21.304
Chalesterine (resembling spermaceti)...	0.438
Oleic and margaric acids. ....	7.226
Phosphoglyceric acid.. ....	1.2
Muriate of ammonia.....	0.034
Chloride of sodium and potassium and sulphate of potash .....	0.277
Phosphates of lime and magnesia...	1.022
Animal extracts.....	0.4
Coloring matter, etc.....	0.553

## *Seeking the Truth.*

after it is once killed. Nor can any chemical knowledge manufacture a living, crowing cock.

Taking the egg and the chicken as typical specimens of animal reproduction, the student gains a knowledge of a limit to human power, and he also discovers positive proof of a power greater than human in strength, in intelligence, and in wisdom, constantly at work producing the effects which are before the inspector's gaze. The similarity in effect in the fourteen departments of zoölogy is convincing as to unity of the great architect whose work has been so carefully studied and classified. The egg is said to be the most beautiful, as it is the most instructive, display of skill in structure to be found in animal product; and as an egg of some form seems to be the starting point of all animals, it is worthy of closest study. "Omne animal ex ovo" has been taken as true by naturalists, although in the case of mammals the hatching is not done exteriorly from the mother parent.

The next field for reverential study may be found in the "heavens above and in the earth beneath." Here effects as vast, as glorious, and as astonishing meet the observant eye. No human mind can grasp the size, as no human tongue can tell the glory, of the material universe. What, and how much of the "what," can the student certainly know? He can know something of the locality or country in which his home is found, he can scan trustworthy information gained from other students that are in other parts of the habitable earth. From the varied sources of positive knowledge he feels certain that the change



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

from day to night is produced by the revolution of the earth on its axis. He sees that the sun rises and sets, and he is thoroughly convinced that the earth is a ball, as there are persons who have gone around it and found the circumference to be about twenty-five thousand miles. He as certainly knows that seasons succeed each other during every year, and that the vegetable growth (about which he had previously studied) could not be if the winter's cold continued the whole of the year. He also feels satisfied that climates differ in certain zones from the temperature in other zones.

Now going to a fellow-student, one who has made astronomy a special study, our investigator secures an explanation of the change of the seasons. This explanation he verifies by an experiment with a burning lamp, and a ball which he holds in his hand. He plainly sees that when he gives the ball only the motion around its axis there could be only alternate darkness and light to the parts of the ball; he also discovers that if he carries the ball in a circular journey around the lamp, but keeps the axis at a right angle to the plane of its orbit, there will be no change on the ball's surface similar to the change of seasons on our globe. But if he makes the axis and the plane to form an angle of about  $23\frac{1}{2}$  degrees, and holds the ball so that lines representing the axis in different parts of the orbit will be exactly parallel, and hence have the same angle, he finds the effect to be just such as will show the change found to be that of spring, summer, autumn, and winter. Hence it is put down as certain science (though the knowledge

## *Seeking the Truth.*

is acquired) that the earth has two motions, that on its axis and that around the sun; while the axis always keeps itself at the same angle to the plane of the earth's orbit. That what is known as the change of seasons is the effect of the inclination of the axis above named cannot be denied; that the effect was designed is equally clear; nor is the conclusion less compulsory when by investigation it is discovered that other planets have a different inclination, that of Jupiter being not quite four degrees. The manipulation in each case seems to have been accordant with what was designed to be the effect on the surface of the particular planet.

The mathematical exactness with which this planetary arrangement has been maintained during the centuries of the world's history must preclude every supposition of chance work as cause of the effects placed before the student's eye. The chaos spoken of by Ovid ("Semina discorda rerum non bene junctarum" = "The seeds of things discordant, not well joined together") could never be the result of studying machinery so delicately formed, for an effect so plain as that which is known on our earth. Chaos is not, order is, unmistakable in testimony of wise forethought. The plan of a building is the guide of the mechanics engaged in the structure; but after the completion of the work, the observer gets a knowledge of the plan by an investigation of the adaptation of the parts to the whole and of the whole to the purpose thereof. No one when going into a building supplied with stalls, hayracks, mangers, etc., would suppose that the design was to erect a dormitory for

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

human beings; nor would the lowest grade of intelligence reach the thought that birds were engaged in building structures for the habitation of oxen or swine. Incongruous thinking is not normal thinking, but it is a mark of insanity.

The sciences of architecture may well suggest another thought as important as instructive in the search for truth. It is the certain conviction that unity in effects proves unity in design. A great structure that has all its parts exactly tributary to one great effect, and to no other, can hardly be ascribed to variegated design. One architect must have controlled the plans and specifications of a building that presents rigid unity in adaptation and results. Certainly antagonistic tastes and desires in a multitude of planners having equal authority over the building could not be expected to produce an effect harmonious in all its aspects. When a contract is made for a building, the grand purpose for which it is to be constructed must be the guiding and governing motive in all plans of purchasing and using materials.

Applying this undoubted principle to the varied departments of study of which a hint has been given in the preceding pages, the student must discover an unvarying unity of purpose running through all the workings of the material universe, no matter how complex or how simple, how minute or how sublime.

The sprouting of the corn, the reproduction of the seed corn, the chemical operations carried on in the soil and in the growing stalk, the variety found in animal life known to the student of zoölogy—all these, no less than the amazingly sublime movements of the

## *Seeking the Truth.*

heavenly bodies as they are known to astronomers, are uncontradicted and uncontradictable evidences of a provision of and a provision for the grand result of having a rolling earth whose soil and products should be as we find them on this planet. No one of the delicate and minute (certainly no one of the sublime and great) parts of this immense workshop could be destroyed without the nullification of the grand purpose. The action of the little caulicle and plumule discovered to be proceeding from the heart of the grain must be considered as important in making a crop as are the powerful rays of the great sun that reach the earth's soil after a journey of ninety millions of miles. The wisdom that formed the one must have dictated the action of the other. The true reasoner can find no way of avoiding this conclusion.

Now when thoughts are turned from what might be called the objective to what we may name as the subjective—or, in other words, when our student changes from the study of the outer world to a careful investigation of his own being—what is found to be known and what unknown? By all the tests of knowledge man knows that he has a body embracing some parts under his volitional control and other parts not under that control in ordinary action. He can raise his hand to grasp an apple; he can order certain muscles to throw that apple away, or he can determine to carry it to his mouth and make it a contribution to his digestive organs; but he cannot forbid or sustain the action of the juices in the intestinal canal, nor can he avoid the chemical process that must follow if the apple should be green or

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

otherwise unfit for the stomach. Man can feel his own pulse and know the number of heart beats per minute; but he cannot order the muscles of the heart to this or that peculiar action according to his will, nor can he decree the number of years the heart will continue to work.

Two remarkable facts are worthy of close thought in regard to muscular action. The first is that the actions which the human will can control are not vital. Life is not dependent upon those actions for the moment. Man can be still and live, he can act and live. The other truth is that the muscles not under man's control are concerned with vitality. If the heart ceases to perform its functions, and arterial blood ceases to go forth from the wonderful fountain, the body dies.

If the thinker will place these two truths alongside of the well-known fact that a dead body cannot be called to life by a power less than that which originally made life, he must reach the thought that was suggested in the study of vegetative life currents, and in the constitution of an egg in the study of animal reproduction: that all vitality has its origin and support in a will other than that of the human mind. The life elements are retained in the life factory under the government of the original worker therein. Every phase of living things, vegetable or animal, may be called to attest this truth.

The exhortation of the Grecian sage, "Know thyself," may induce our thinker to proceed farther in subjective investigation. He immediately discovers from what he has thought about his body that the

## *Seeking the Truth.*

thinking was not done by the body. He knows that the amputation of a finger or a toe will not decrease the power to prove a proposition in geometry. He knows (if he thinks) he has a thinker; but he also knows that there is a mysterious union of mind and body. He knows his fingers that obey the mandates of his will are material, but he is equally sure that the mind is not material. A spiritual entity is as much a matter of knowledge as is any entity at all. Consciousness is that to which appeal is made. Now in like manner it is shown that the consciousness of memory makes this thinker know that he was a thinker yesterday, and it may be a number of years ago; but he with equal certainty knows that he was not present with Herodotus when he wrote his history, nor did he hear Homer recite the "Iliad" or "Odyssey." He (if an American citizen in 1905) knows that he did not vote for General Washington to be President. His consciousness had a starting point. Of necessity it had a starter. Thinking without knowing this much is an impossibility. For if a man knows that he now exercises thought power, he is certainly aware of nonthought on his part before that power had birth.

It is equally clear that a nonthinking thing could not be the creator of a thinker. Especially is it positively certain that a thinker having powers evidently designed for certain activities should be a constant testimony to design in the work of origination. The oft-quoted adage, "Ab nihilo nihil fit" ("From nothing, nothing comes"), will suggest a truth of which the mind is quite unable to rid itself—viz.: "From a non-designing cause no design in the effect can be predicated."

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

The study of the mental powers of man evidently will show that there is a design in the make-up of those powers. If it is impossible for the normal mind to be void of all action, it must have been designed for action. If that mind has power of increasing its store of knowledge, the design must have been to originate a being competent to learn. If the average man has innate feelings of honor and dishonor, right and wrong—of oughtness and its opposite—then a moral agent must have been designed. Two truths hence force themselves upon the investigator—viz.: Mind in humanity had origin; secondly, there was design in that origin.

Further obedience to the command "Know thyself" must generate some inquiry as to the position of human beings in the graduated scale of animal life. In the list of genera where shall the "genus homo" be placed? Shall man be thought of as rising no higher in nature than the beasts of prey seeking weaker living forms to be victims of a carnivorous appetite? or shall he be graded with the cattle upon a thousand hills, whose teeth indicate a graminivorous propensity? Will the birds that make long journeys in aërial flights or the reptiles that find homes among the mountain rocks claim a dignity equal to that stamped upon the human family? The thinker can give no affirmative reply to these questions. He is by compulsion brought to suppose the race to which he belongs to be the *summum genus* of living beings confined to the earth's surface as a place of abode. He knows a lion to be stronger in muscle, a bird to be more rapid in locomotion, than a boy or a man; but in the products of thought he

## *Seeking the Truth.*

knows the superiority of man's genius. The tick of the telegraphic instrument, the whistle of the steam engine, the projectiles from thundering artillery at Gettysburg, or more recently the torpedo boats that sent so many strong ships to the bottom of the Japan Sea, will forever abolish the notion that man is only an animal gifted with mere instinct. The possession of mind gives to the citizens of the world the highest grade of earthly life. The sad truth that mind powers are so often wrongly used, and hence murder and suicides have characterized much of the world's history, will not minify the argument as to mental power; but it only strengthens the conviction of a responsibility differing from that which belongs to instinct.

That the foregoing placement of man in the highest grade of earthly beings is according to truth is shown by the study of the design of the designs (*consilium consiliorum*) pointed out in the workings of the various departments of vegetative and animal products. What sentient being was to be profited by the sublime masonry found on the earth and above it whose food was to be provided by the living cornstalk and the nicely adjusted cell arrangement that was necessary to growth? Whose joy was to be promoted by the fertilizing arrangements, by the beauty and perfumery of flowers, by the music of gentle breezes or the coming of refreshing showers? Say these things are for all animals, and the reply is quickly at hand that all lower animals are in the service of man. Domestic animals are regarded as property; wild animals are the legitimate objects of the hunter and the trapper,



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

and are owned when captured or killed. In the courts of civilization a man that shoots his neighbor for pecuniary gain may be condemned to the hangman's rope; but the marksman that secures good venison by shooting the beautiful swift-running deer will be commended by his fellow-citizens.

The sublimity, the multiplicity of parts, the complexity of machinery, the incomprehensible wisdom involved in that make-up of Nature's workshop will by no means destroy the validity of that class of thinking which supposes the interests of the human family to have been thought of when light was generated, while the earth was hung upon nothing and sent forth upon its magnificent journeyings. Each grain of corn that sends forth a caulicle and a plumule may be named as proof of design to multiply grains; but the ultimate design of those grains must be to supply food to the eater as well as seed to the planter, while the angle of inclination of the earth's axis had the same great plan in view. The laws governing the reflection and refraction of the rays of light, flying with almost inconceivable velocity through the universe, are positively ascertained by convincing experiments. The consequent invention of the telescope and microscope has made the knowledge of man to extend millions of miles in the starry-decked physical heavens, and to reach down to the multiplied millions of living things that dance unseen beyond the gaze of the naked eye; but neither in telescopic sweep nor in microscopic minuteness has anything living or dead been found uninfluenced by certain plainly shown laws of matter. The most prominent of these laws

## *Seeking the Truth.*

is, perhaps, the law of gravity. In the stars that twinkle billions of miles away from the stargazer, and in the atoms used by the microscopic masons that build coral islands, this great law is constantly operative. Gravity seems absolutely needed in the constitution and the comfort and beauty of man's earthly home. Its design seems plainly written in every department of human interest.

The rotundity of planets no less than the croppage found in field and forest on earth may largely be attributed to the prevalence of gravity. Without this law other laws could hardly accomplish their supposed end.

It is, however, as plainly seen in Nature's toil that when the great design of making man's home seemed to require a suspension of gravity such result seemed to be fact. Say it is only in seeming, the instruction is not lessened. For machinery is necessitated to cause the seeming. Water will not run uphill, but by some means it does go upward from ocean's bosom to form the clouds that send the showers downward. Matter tends toward the center of the earth; but as certainly, in vegetable growth, potash and other ingredients by some action are constantly going from the soil upward to the summit of the tree, though that tree be hundreds of feet high. The caulicle of the seed turns downward; but as obstinately the plumule (though having the same kind of matter) refuses to follow the example, and begins an upward movement. The potash carried upward by the vegetative law will certainly begin a downward journey when its twig is severed from the tree.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

Investigations of reproduction make the assertion sustainable that a circuit is characteristic of natural movements. No civil circuit judge, no Methodist preacher, ever was expected to come round to the same point as certainly as the same results are expected to come round in the movements of planetary orbs. Round and round proceed the parts of the great "merry-go-round," dispensing advantages to the object of its existence, as surely as event follows event in beneficent toil.

In the whirligig of immensity, in the wheels within wheels subject to one great wheel whose spokes extend to a distance that defies measuring apparatus, man may discern his own importance in the council chambers of eternity, and the indescribable reverence with which the student should be filled when he tries to learn the disposition toward himself of the Supreme Judge in the jurisprudence of heaven and earth. He may also be impressed with the enormity of the crime that belongs to the created mind that tries to defeat the plans of that originator of the great machinery.

The inertia of matter is, however, as much a teaching of true science as is the discovery of all the motions to which attention has been called. The meaning given to this characteristic is about the same in every system of philosophic thought. Huxley and Spencer no less than Newton and Locke, or than the Herschels and still more recent great thinkers, seem to declare that power to begin or to stop a movement cannot be attributed to dead matter. Agreement here is as remarkable as are the disagreements found in

## Seeking the Truth.

their writings on other points. All philosophers also agree with common sense in the affirmation that motion is normal in the heavens and on the earth. From the wavelet's tiniest ripple or from the least noisy zephyr breeze to the sublimest movements of storms on earth, or to the amazing activity of suns and constellations in the heavens, there comes the same lesson of industry. It is equally clear to common sense that results prove design in motion, but the thing incompetent of itself to act could not originate the motive or design of action. Hence a common sense investigator must suppose that he has reached a truth to which all thinkers will readily assent—viz., that matter is incompetent of self-motion, yet all material bodies are constantly changing as to place; therefore the mover must be other than matter (*id est ab extra*). That this mover was the designer of the effects following motions seem equally the demand of common sense. From every department of scientific search—from chemistry, astronomy, physiology, physics, anatomy, agriculture, horticulture, zoölogy, forestry, botany, etc.—this demand comes with authoritative force. This is true, because in all learning in which matter is an element of study the two facts appear—inertia of matter and the moving of matter.

The searcher for truth is then compelled to agree with the dictum of that great mind, Mr. Herbert Spencer, when he says: "It is certain there is a great, all-permeating, intelligent energy from which all things proceed." This quotation is given on the authority of Dr. Abbott, of New York, in the *Outlook*. Its equivalent (or very nearly so) may be found on

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

page 551 of "Synthetic Philosophy," as follows—viz.: "We saw that the belief in a Power of which no limit in time or space can be conceived is that fundamental element in religion which survives all its changes of form. We saw that all philosophies avowedly or tacitly recognize the same ultimate truth—that, while the relativist repudiates the definite assertions which the absolutist makes respecting existence transcending perception, he is yet at last compelled to unite with him in predicating existence transcending perception. And this inexpugnable consciousness, in which religion and philosophy and common sense agree, proved to be likewise that on which all exact science is based."

Again (on page 557) this is found—viz.: "Being fully convinced that, whatever nomenclature is used, the ultimate mystery must remain the same, he [the thinker] will be as ready to formulate all phenomena in terms of matter force and motion as in any other terms, and will rather indeed anticipate that only in a doctrine which recognizes the unknown cause as coextensive with all others of phenomena can there be a consistent religion or a consistent philosophy."

It is very much to be regretted that a mind so gifted as that of the author quoted should have written over five hundred pages before giving the above sentences as the conclusion or end of his investigations. Especially is this regret pungent when one reflects on the almost invariable use which has been made of the majority of those pages—viz., to unsettle the thinking of so many as to the agreement of true religion and true science. An incident told by Mr.

## *Seeking the Truth.*

Spencer relative to his adoption of certain forms of words in the make-up of his theories may at once illustrate both the source of the above-named regret and the blame to be attached to an author for the ill use of his writing. He proposed to write of "Evolution," "Segregation," "Equilibration," and "Dissolution," and then to formulate a "summary" and "conclusion." In reference to the changes which were to be named as constantly going on in material things, he needed a formula of cause for the changes. He thought of "conservation of force" as appropriate; but afterwards thought this formula objectionable because it would necessitate the idea of a Being to conserve, a conservator. He consulted Mr. Huxley, who suggested "persistence of force" as a formula to give relief. Hence throughout the great volume this formula is used.

It seems next to certainty that an ordinary or a learned reader would at once come to the conclusion that both of these gifted philosophers intended to exclude the notion of a caused entity from the expression giving character to the agent called "Force." Otherwise, why did they object to "Conservation of Force?" No explanation can be given void of the idea of such a difference between "conservation" and "persistence" as would indicate self action or being in the latter word that "Force" had no power behind itself to call it into activity. This idea is evidently absent from the quotation from the latter part of Mr. Spencer's great work, in which the assertion is made, "It is certain there is an all-pervading intelligent energy from which all things proceed," etc. This as-

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

sertion must be fact unless the author intended "force" and "intelligent energy" to be synonymous; but if this were his intention, it would follow that in his mind "force" was gifted with mental power, and hence action was uncaused except by this inherent possession. It is easy to see that such a notion of "force" would gift it with Deity, instead of regarding it as something created by Deity.

Now it is entirely supposable that the usual definition of "force" was acceptable to the two philosophers above named, as it seems to be adopted by all teachers of the science of physics. Webster gives it as follows—viz.: "Any action between two bodies which changes or tends to change their relative conditions as to rest or motion; or more generally which changes or tends to change any physical relation between them, whether mechanical, thermal, chemical, electrical, magnetic, or of any other kind; as, the *force* of gravity, cohesive *force*, centrifugal *force*," etc. It cannot be called a material or mental thing, but an action graded by effects of something upon something. Hence to talk of an uncaused force is as sensible as to speak of a thought unmade by a thinker, or of the propulsion of a ball from a cannon without any cannon or user of a cannon. Who can suppose either Huxley or Spencer intended mere nonsense? It seems quite clear that this question suggests the nonrecognition (on the part of both these great men) of the truth that their investigations would lead to assertions so nearly akin to the Mosaic record as are the sentences taken from Mr. Spencer's "conclusion."

The theory of "Evolution, Segregation, Equilibra-

## *Seeking the Truth.*

tion, Dissolution," etc., did not require any such an idea as an uncaused force, but did require the admission of a Great Power from which all things proceed. This admission is clearly made by the author quoted; and one is readily reminded of the well-known words, "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and of the creed which speaks of "God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth."

Reading studiously through the "Synthetic Philosophy," one can hardly fail to admire the genius which brought so much of thinking energy to the work of trying to account for the panorama now before human gaze; nor can the reflective student cease to regret the failure, through so many pages, to insist upon the true dynamic in all the supposed operations of law or laws. A law unenforced is a nullity; a law enforced proves a faithful executive.

If we understand the above-named philosophy, it may be put in a nutshell as follows—viz.:

1. The present material universe has been evolved from a protoplasmic condition.
2. It will not remain as it now is, but will go on evolving until the end of evolution's power.
3. The cessation of evolution will be followed by a system of segregation, equilibration, and final dissolution.
4. These last will be followed by a return of evolution to go on in the aforementioned cycle round and round eternally.
5. This eternal cycle has its origin in the decree of a Power as unknowable as unknown.

In the multitudinous and well-written pages com-



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

ing from the gifted pen to which attention has been called, there are noted many scientific facts thoroughly established by observatory or laboratory toil. So far as evolution (an unrolling) is shown by these facts, it must be accepted. To such investigators as the so-called scientists are, the world is indebted for much of positive knowledge. That a tree is evolved from its seed, that an animal comes from its egg, may be readily taken as known. But if one is asked to accept as positive science the assertion that protoplasmic star dust preceded the formation of a single rolling planet in the immensity of space, or that it was before the calling of light into existence; that all things that we now know to be will go back to star dust again in order that a new evolution may begin its work—that person *must*, it seems to this writer, utter the sentiment: "It is not proved, it is not provable." (*Non probatur et non probandum.*) Hence it cannot enter the curriculum of science. The limit of science must be found when the human mind has reached the limit of observation and experiment and of the reach of logical or proving thought upon what is discovered by observation or experiment. Acquired knowledge cannot go to star dust; hence it cannot be positively asserted that star dust was or will be. But the truth seeker reaches undoubted facts of observation and experiment that point directly to creative power and wisdom without attempting this long and impossible journey. Reference to what was said about vegetable and animal reproduction must be sufficient to satisfy the thoughtful inquirer. The agnostic as to star dust need not be an agnostic as to divinity.

## *Seeking the Truth.*

In view of this thought, it may be proper to reproduce Mr. Spencer's sixteenth and closing proposition of his discussion. He says: "That which persists unchanging in quantity but ever changing in form under these sensible appearances which the universe presents to us transcends human knowledge and conception—is an unknown and unknowable power which we are obliged to recognize as without limit in space and without beginning or end in time." Several pertinent reflections may here be suggested *to* and *by* the thoughtful man.

1. An unknown and unknowable power is placed in this proposition as the great *persister*, and there was no need for Mr. Huxley's idea of difference between "persistence of force" and "conservation of force." If the latter implied a conservator, the former implied a persister.

2. Here is found the final result of a vast mass of reasoning from a profound thinker regarded as the leader of his class of philosophers. In this final result we clearly see an abandonment of what seemed to be involved in the account given of Mr. Huxley's interview with the author of "Synthetic Philosophy."

3. If this profound thinker (usually supposed to favor a class of thinkers who would try to have a philosophy "without the hypothesis of a God") could reach no thought as to cause but that of one great spiritual entity "without limit in space and without beginning or end in time," how can atheism or infidelity ever expect to find a basis of reasoning that will not aver "in the beginning God?"

4. The more one reflects on the final proposition of

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

Mr. Spencer, the more is impressed upon the mind the great misfortune to literature, and hence to the world, of a genius allowing so much of his literary work to be so worded as to make it even supposable that that genius accepted matter, force, and motion to be sufficient to formulate a philosophy of the universe.

To accept the idea of such sufficiency in the things represented by these three words would be as sensible as it would be to say that the great library building in Washington and the books therein were all made by stone, lime, water, paper, and other materials, without any mind work in planning or in execution of plan. It would be as void of common sense as to say that Mr. Spencer's volumes were made by paper, pen, ink, and a hand unguided by spiritual intellect.

Now from all the things to which in the preceding pages the reader's attention has been called, the humble writer supposes a great syllogism may be constructed which will be as comforting as convincing to the searcher for truth. The premises of this syllogism must be common-sense propositions, known to those who use common sense in thinking. They must show an avoidance of any statement which can be called doubtful by a mind fully rational and well informed as to natural law. They must be based upon conclusions from minor syllogisms equally as unprejudiced as this major syllogism is designated to be.

There are some assertions so nearly if not entirely intuitional as to be regarded as having no need of proof; and some of these may be here introduced, to

## *Seeking the Truth.*

add plainness or simplicity to the succeeding thought or logic.

The first that presents itself is that if matter be dead it is barred from being the author of thought, life, motion, or force.

The second is that if evolution be a fact in the history of matter or of life it must as much require an evoluter (a power to cause unrolling) as creation requires a creator or an action requires an actor. But if evolution be an untrue theory of the present state of the world, then the thinker sees a need for the thought of a cause that does not choose to adopt that mode of creating effects. True or untrue, the idea of evolution can never detract anything from the thought of needed cause with an attribute that does not belong to dead matter. The doctrine of Moses is as much needed in the one case as in the other. It is equally clear that man cannot give testimony in a matter beyond his experience and beyond any reasoning based upon experience.

The next axiomatic assertion is that when plan or design is positively and plainly, even necessarily, seen in an effect—that is, when this effect could not be upon any other supposition than that of a knower who planned it—the mind of a thinker is compelled to admit a thinker was the originating cause. There are two groves within view of a person standing at the post office of the college named on a preceding page. In many respects they seem alike when the observer is distant as much as two hundred yards; but when this writer visited and walked through each, he found the trees in one grove to be in parallel lines, apparent-

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

ly with mathematical exactness; in the other grove the trees were as usually found in a forest. Now it would be impossible to convince the beholder that he did not know that the parallelism in the grove called "the arboretum" by professors and students was caused by a thinker that placed seeds or scions in their location. But as to the other grove the averment is as confidentially made that the origination was not with the idea of parallel lines. Still further it may be said that, as forests grown in the ordinary way, or by the workings of what are called natural laws, usually are not composed of trees in parallel lines, the conviction is surely asserted that a human mind desired and secured the parallelism. But if it were true that man had not the capability of doing this much of placing trees in rows, the cause would be sought in a mind greater than that of an earthly mathematician. There would be no abandonment of the assertion that regularity in effects shows design in cause. Hence it is rationally asserted that design is shown in the machinery of animal and vegetative life; and that the designer must be a mind greater than human, because all the parts of seeds and eggs immediately vital are not producible by a human genius, even though the chemical elements may be placed in man's hands.

Now this class of intuitional thought may lead the truth searcher to the formation of certain syllogisms seemingly void of any fallacy shown in books of logic—viz.:

1. (a) All effects seen by man in the vegetable kingdom showing fruitage designed in the life current from seeds to fruit must have had a designing cause.

## *Seeking the Truth.*

(b) The croppage derived from field and forest shows fruitage designed as effect.

(c) Therefore the croppage had a designing cause.

2. (a) All effects observed in the animal kingdom showing the support or continuance of life to be designed had a designing cause.

(b) The movements not under animal control, though taking place in animal bodies, show such design with very remarkable plainness.

(c) Therefore they had a designing cause.

3. (a) All effects in world or star movements designedly causing changes of temperature on the earth's surface must have had a designing cause.

(b) The effect known by astronomers as the inclination of the earth's axis to the orbital plane (together with parallelism of axis) does produce designed changes of temperature on the earth's surface.

(c) Therefore it had a designing cause.

4. (a) When all designing causes of the parts of a great system show agreement in contribution to one greater effect (*effectum effectorum*), there must be unity of thought in the designing cause; and hence unity of being in the great designer or the cause of causes (*causa causarum*) must be one.

(b) The evident agreement of the causes as to the parts of the universe can be appealed to as plainly pointing to oneness of design—viz., the production of an earthly home for the highest grade of sentient beings having physical and spiritual wants—the *genus homo*, or man.

(c) Hence unity in the great designer is evident.

It is quite evident that syllogisms of a similar char-

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

acter to 1, 2, and 3 could be formulated from any other parts of the material universe not supposed to be included in the parts named; and their conclusions would as certainly point to the fact named in the minor premise of 4 as do the conclusions named. Hence the truth of 4 seems authenticated.

It is equally certain that if there be a designer that power must be a great Spiritual Being, and Moses wrote the truth when he penned "In the beginning God." Any other than a thinker making a plan or design is unthinkable. Any other than a Being having attributes such as belong to the Creator cannot be predicated as the cause of causes. Hence the searcher for truth thinks he has found certain truth when he joyfully accords truth to the lines of Eliza Cook, as follows:

God hath a voice that is ever heard  
In the peal of the thunder, the chirp of the bird;  
It comes in the torrent all rapid and strong,  
In the streamlet's soft gush as it ripples along;  
It is known in the zephyr just kissing the bloom,  
It is heard in the sweep of the rapid simoon;  
Let hurricanes whistle or warblers rejoice,  
What do they tell thee but God hath a voice?

God hath a presence, and that ye may see  
In the fold of the flower, the leaf of the tree,  
In the sun of the noonday, the star of the night,  
In the storm cloud of darkness, the rainbow of light,  
In the waves of the ocean, the furrows of land,  
In the mountain of granite, the atom of sand.  
Turn where you may, from the sky to the sod,  
Where can you gaze that you see not our God?

Having thus, by a course of thought which in no part of the reasoning excludes certainty, discovered a

## *Seeking the Truth.*

grand proposition bidding defiance to all possible denial, the common-sense thinker wonders not that the great mental toilers whose works fill the libraries of the world have acted upon the truth "God is." From the days of Socrates to those of Webster, Clay, and Calhoun, and on to the period of American history when Theodore Roosevelt directs the executive department of a great republic, the great thinkers of all nations have reached at least the idea recorded by Mr. Spencer as his own—viz., that power producing the things seen and known by man must be "without limit in space and without beginning or end in time."

The sincere investigator, however, does wonder that so astute a philosopher as Herbert Spencer should apply the adjectives "unknown" and "unknowable" to a great Spirit whose existence, eternity, and omnipresence he has so abundantly proved. If there be any such idea as the agnosticism of the words of the quotation indicate lingering yet in philosophic halls, to these halls let the language be uttered: "Whom ye ignorantly recognize, him declares true investigation to you." Nothing can be called "unknown" to which the terms "unlimited" and "eternal" can knowingly be applied. No spirit capable of self-revelation can be called "unknowable."

The argument from design, suggested by the workings of natural law to which attention has been called, brings the student to a conclusion so positive that there seems no need, so far as the object of this writing is concerned, to introduce other theistic arguments. The reader who desires a description of "the ontological," "the cosmological," "the historical," and



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

other phases of argument used by varied writers is referred to the valuable, able, and instructive work of Dr. J. J. Tigert, published by the Southern Methodist Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn., and entitled "Theism."

Here, however, it may be proper to remark as to the thought of Immanuel Kant upon the argument from design, as that thought is quoted by Dr. Tigert. It seems the great German transcendental philosopher after using language of the highest praise in regard to the argument aforesaid, such language as the following—viz.: "Roused from every inquisitive indecision, as from a dream, by one glance at the wonders of nature and the majesty of the cosmos, reason soars from height to height till it reaches the highest; from the conditioned to the conditions, till it reaches the Supreme and unconditioned Author of all." Even after this he says: "But although we have had nothing to say against the reasonableness and utility of this line of argument, but wish on the contrary to commend and encourage it, we cannot approve of the claims which this proof advances to apodictic certainty and to an approval on its own merits, requiring no favor and no help from any other quarter." Dr. Tigert very properly remarks: "Such claims no reasonable theist of to-day will set up." (See "Theism," pp. 152, 153.)

Reasoning in the form of argument must have "helps from other quarters" in order to formulate premises, but premises uncontradictable must give an uncontradictable conclusion is what the philosopher called "apodictic certainty." The term "apodictic"

## Seeking the Truth.

(derived from the Greek word ἀποδίδενημι) must mean "proved beyond contradiction;" and it seems quite clear that the quotation above noted leaves but little room to doubt the conviction of Kant as to the premises of the argument from design. But as he had inaugurated a philosophy which taught the difference between phenomenon and "the thing itself," the philosopher seemed to suppose that consistency required the latter part of the quotation. Unfortunately, he failed to declare his belief as to the uncontradictable character of the major and minor premise in the argument from design.

But if the mind of any one has made ill use of the Kantian doctrine—one which Kant himself never allowed in his own thinking—the doubt must be in reference to the truth of each minor premise—that is, the doubter must suppose that it may be possible for no design to be actual as to cause and effect so plainly observed in movements. According to this, it is possible that no designer caused the obstinacy of caulicle and plumule, the one to go downward, the other upward; trees *might* grow with roots in the air, and branches producing apples *might* be underground; no designer caused the ascent of sap in a tree or of vapor from the ocean, both in apparent opposition to gravity; no designer fixed the exact angle made by the axis of the earth with the plane of its orbit—in fine, natural law evidently showing design operates without being enacted by a legislative designer, and is hence an effect without a cause, but not an effect without power.

Such incongruous thoughts may have been sug-

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

gested by some agency in the history of mind; for equal absurdities are easily discovered in the creeds of some of the isms that claim many followers. Some persons speak of the laws of nature as eternal in the past as well as in the future, and hence the expression "eternal laws of nature" may have been used to oppose the truthfulness of history that tells of a rising from the dead. These persons seem oblivious to the fact of a misconception of the thing called "nature" or of a misnomer in nomenclature. The word is evidently derived from the same verb from which the English language acquires the terms "native," "nativity," etc., and means "a thing born." (Latin, *natum*, p.p of *nascor*.)

It is impossible to dis sever the notion of the necessity of parentage from "nature." It is equally absurd to declare a misconception of the thing named "nature" when we say there is a mover, if a thing incompetent of self-motion is moved from the earth upward. We know the motion begins in time. The word "eternal" is not applicable to the motion; it may be and is to the Being *now* causing the motion. If nature then had a legislative Father, and natural law was designedly made by that Father, it is impossible in thought to take away from that Great One the ability to tell his spiritual creatures all they need to know of further laws not natural but moral.

If Herbert Spencer had used his great talents in an effort to show an answer to the question, "Has the Great Energy spoken in language as well as in works?" and had he wrought on this with the same industry exhibited in his philosophy, he could hardly have closed

## *Seeking the Truth.*

his greatest literary work with the apparent contradiction of his previous doctrine, evidently claiming knowledge of a "power unlimited in space and without beginning or end in time." Had he followed Kepler and said, after an examination of the above-named great subject, "I have been thinking the thoughts of God," would he not have desired and sought to know the words as well as the works of the Great Architect? What was known of the power which Mr. Spencer inconsistently called "the unknown and the unknowable" should have led to an inquiry as to the truth of such a declaration as the following—viz., "Hear, O heavens, give ear, O earth, for the Great Power has spoken;" and when the spoken words were put upon record and plainly proved to have come from Him who was the Parent of nature itself, and told all that a finite moral agent needed to know of the infinite Ruler, the doubt as to the minor premise in the argument from design *must* have been removed, even though such a doubt could be only imaginary.

The searcher for truth, having thus satisfied himself of the existence of "God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth," and learning that the following words are also on record—viz., "I have nurtured and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me"—now desires to know all that the words which have come from God tell of a relief from such wrong, and also if the American people have in English a true version of Revealed Truth. Hence attention is invited to the following chapters.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE WORDS OF CHRIST OUR GUIDE.

THE human mind is utterly incompetent to place thought upon a subject more important than that which relates to the eternal happiness of the human soul. The question, "What must I do to be saved?" is one whose importance can never be excelled by that of any other entering into the possibilities of human inquiry. This is necessarily true if mind is immortal. It is especially true if moral agency or accountability is attached to the actions of the mental being during a period of existence, called "probation," known to be of short duration.

The percipient faculties of intelligence are concordant in testimony as to the wrongs found in earth's history. Neither personal nor national story can be honestly studied without the thorough conviction that "man's inhumanity to man makes countless thousands mourn." The press of the present age is constant in its testimony of the deeds of iniquity. We of the United States can hardly suppose a single mail train on our railroads or a single mail steamer on our waters unburdened by a heavy freightage of printed matter telling of revolting crimes. With equal certainty we must admit the inability of a sound intellect to have the thought that no result is to follow the perpetration of wicked deeds. Guilt must belong to the wrongdoer; and this guilt unremoved must have its fruit-

## *The Words of Christ Our Guide.*

age in the eternal state. No amount of sophistical reasoning can drive this thought away from the thinkers of time, and hence it must readily be perceived that an indescribable boon has been bestowed upon man if a scheme has been devised by competent authority for the removal of the guilt of sin from the immortal spirit of man. Has such a plan been made? and have its terms been authoritatively proclaimed to sorrowing humanity?

A satisfactory answer to these questions cannot be found in the investigations usually called "scientific." The telescope and the crucible are impotent here. The discovery of new stars or planets in the heavens, the finding of elements hitherto unknown to the chemist, and all other triumphs of toilers in mere material things are unable to give any information upon the subject of salvation. The wonderful thing recently known to the chemist and named by him "Radium" is as speechless in regard to the great inquiry of the seeking soul as was the first element ever shown in the laboratory of investigation. The Great Book of Nature is a revealer of truth—of truth as to the Creator—but not the specific truth needed for the comfort of an anxious penitent. Nowhere in the search for the laws by which Nature's workshop is operated can the philosopher expect to tell the discovery of a truth that will relieve a conscience burdened with the guilt of sin. The Psalmist gave the true mission of Nature's book when he eloquently proclaimed, "The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handiwork." Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge;" but in such

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

glory and in such knowledge we do not find the important words, "pardon on account of a redemptive scheme." If "Orion rising and Arcturus guiding his suns" cannot be void of an implied declaration that "the hand that made us is divine," neither the one constellation nor the other can be looked upon as witnessing to the needed truth in the following stanza:

"There is a fountain filled with blood  
Drawn from Immanuel's veins;  
And sinners plunged beneath that flood  
Lose all their guilty stains."

To prove the divine origin of the material universe, or to establish the truth of the narrative that Jehovah's breath brought the soul into existence, can by no means give relief to the man anxious about his future state. Knowledge of a journey's beginning does not give knowledge of its ending or of its subsequents. Hence the honest thinker is easily brought to see the absolute necessity of a revelation from the Arbiter of Destiny that shall contain more than mere history, if a man is to be assured of coming joy in a future life. In such a revelation there must be information as to the required action of the endangered one, in order to the reception of benefit from a plan of rescue; there must also be such promises from the author of the plan as shall make firm, unflinching faith both a great privilege and as great a duty. Such a satisfactory document the Christian world claims to possess in the book called the Holy Bible.

From the ample pages of this great volume the anxious investigator may with certainty derive all needed learning as to the divine will in regard to hu-

## *The Words of Christ Our Guide.*

man salvation. History, prophecy, promise, and command are all given under circumstances of the greatest proving power to make the mind void of distressing doubt or carking care. Especially may the life and words of Jesus of Nazareth, as recorded in the four Gospels, be put in evidence to show that the offer of spiritual and everlasting good is made to every person willing to formulate his after course in obedience to the requirements of the merciful Saviour. If the intelligent mind were so situated as to have no access to the other parts of the Holy Writ, but had free and constant use of the four Gospels, in that mind there would be no need of ignorance on the question of Christ's desire to save, or of the further question of human privilege and duty in the matter of taking Christ at his word.

To value the Book of books, then, because it gives (in language so plain that a wayfaring man can understand) the mind of Jehovah toward fallen man in a manner and in a matter untaught by human investigation in the heavens above or in the earth beneath, seems one of the first demands upon human thought. Neglect is crime, because it is a sin against one's own soul as well as a disregard of the positive injunction of heaven's Ruler. Nor can the enlightened Christian, by possibility, see other than gross wrong in those who, professing to value the Bible for their own reading, are entirely careless about giving the sacred text to the masses of the people. No one of the apostles was exempt from the command to go and to teach, and the pupils were to be found wherever immortal souls were discovered; and that no one was designed to be



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

neglected must be plainly seen from the words "all nations" used by one writer and "every creature" used by another. It is also an undeniable truth that the Son of God on one occasion had given the injunction, "Search the scriptures," stating that they were the writings that testified of himself and his mission. The reference undoubtedly was to those volumes that were acknowledged to be revealments of Jehovah's commands, promises, and prophecies made for the guidance of moral agents. The New Testament Scriptures containing the very words of the atoning Saviour, followed by a history of apostolic acts and by epistles recorded by inspired men, must, by Catholic and Protestant, be regarded as having the same authority as the book found in the Jewish possession.

If the Old Testament told of what the Prince of Peace would do when his incarnation had taken place, the New Testament in plain words tells what that Prince actually did to accomplish salvation's scheme. If the one is prospective or prophetic, the other is retrospective or actual; and the command to spread the divine truths contained in both must be as imperative as merciful. Hence all efforts to print and circulate the pure Word of God must be heartily commended by those who love obedience to our Lord's injunction given in the Great Commission. (Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.) The whole world is to be congratulated on the vast work of English and American Bible Societies, whose pious enterprise has made it possible for the poorest of the poor to own the sacred Book; nor does it seem clear to an ordinary mind what can be the course of reasoning on the part of a pro-

## *The Words of Christ Our Guide.*

fessed herald of the cross who would by word or deed discourage obedience to the command, "Search the scriptures." Such a preacher must by implication or by actual statement say to his congregation: "Take my word; but do not look for the original words of God's Son, telling what you must do to be saved." Faith in the veracity of a human being, then, is made the first requisite of an anxious soul in reference to the well-being of that soul in the eternal state. This is done, too, in spite of the fact that history is full of records showing that nearly every organization of men, ecclesiastical or other, has had one or more sad cases of deplorable untruthfulness on the part of men in high places. The true way to preach the gospel, the way adopted by preachers of the apostolic age, seems discoverable from the example of St. Paul at Thessalonica. The account is given as follows in the Rheims-Douay Version (adopted by the Roman Catholic Church): "And Paul, according to his custom, went in unto them; and for three sabbath days he reasoned with them out of the scriptures; declaring and insinuating that the Christ was to suffer and to rise again from the dead; and that this is Jesus Christ whom I preach to you." (See Acts xvii. 2, 3.)

In the version used by the Church of England since the reign of King James I., the language is in accord with the Roman Catholic print with the exception of a few words. The version of King James has "opening and alleging" instead of "declaring and insinuating." But it seems quite clear that the same great truth is contained in both—viz., that Paul preached with the Scriptures along with him (which Scriptures

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

the people possessed), and to Holy Writ he appealed for the truth of his doctrine. It may be added, however, that if a Greek scholar were asked which translation of the Greek words *διανοίγων καὶ παρατιθέμενος* is nearer the thought of the author, the answer would be favorable to the version of King James. The language used by the English Church is the stronger of the two versions and comes nearer the meaning of the original.

## CHAPTER III.

### JEHOVAH'S MODE OF REVELATION.

ADMITTING that omniscience as well as omnipotence must belong to heaven's Architect, the reasoning mind must conclude that the time and manner of all the epiphanies (or showings) of God were the best for the accomplishment of the grand purpose of human good. That the Creator did not adopt any of the modes of action which man's weak fancy, sometimes presumptuously, may have pictured as more in accord with the needs of the case, is a proof not at all derogatory to the wisdom of the plan chosen; but the fancy thus exercised is rather a proof of the depravity of the minds that yield to such reasoning.

What, then, seems to have been the divine plan as to giving his law? Evidently from the most notable parts of the history in reference to the matter we learn that the great "I Am" chose to make himself known by indisputable evidence of just such power as would give authority to the words to be spoken to human actors. Moses was convinced by the blazing but unconsumed bush of the presence of the Deity; and by that conviction he knew that he must go to Egypt to be the leader of Israel. At Sinai the sublimities that made even Moses fear and quake were enough to give authority to the writing of the Decalogue tables. The greatest of all the deeds of heaven's ruler for humanity's elevation can but be viewed in the same light. The climax of beneficence is at-

## *Jehovah's Mode of Revelation.*

tested by the climax of miraculous energy. The soul that knows the truth of the couplet,

“’Twas great to speak a world from naught;  
’Twas greater to redeem,”

must also perceive the superior grade of miracle found in the fact of a dead body bursting the rocky prison house of the tomb, rising therefrom, confounding the military guard, appearing to those who had been disciples, and finally defying gravitation, ascending heavenward in the presence of gazing witnesses. No mere creation of a material world, no building of mountains or digging out of oceans (though these things in an unmistakable manner proclaim power), can equal in dignity the rising and ascending God-man. Three things appear from this brief discussion of “God’s way.” The first is, that sufficient miracle is given by the Author of all things to give authority to the introduction of a dispensation. The second is, that the important or climactic truths of a dispensation were committed to writing in the language vernacular at the time. The third is, that the proclaimers of dogmatical truths were to have the written words to which they were to appeal for the truth of dogma. This latter assertion is of great importance in the present age. Let it be impressed upon all truth-seeking civilization. Israel’s host did not move away from Sinai without carrying the written Decalogue and whatever other sacred writings had been given in that memorable neighborhood.

In all the subsequent history of the chosen tribes the same truths appear. Elijah’s great victory on Car-

## *Jehovah's Mode of Revelation.*

mel's heights may be taken as typical of the giving of what was called sacred and prophetic literature. Nor is it at all uncertain in what light any disrespect or attempted destruction of the sacred volume was held by the Divine Author thereof. Whenever the favored people backslid into criminal idolatry, there was marked neglect of the book; and when there occurred a penitent return toward piety, one of the first evidences of it was a seeking for the records of law and history. The extreme of presumptuous wickedness was reached by the degenerate monarch who cut up and burned the parchments on which were written the words of a Sovereign greater than the owner of the penknife. (See Jer. xxxvi.) His punishment is not left to hypothesis. Nehemiah and Zerubbabel, as well as Ezra, were undoubtedly deeply impressed with the importance of giving to the people the written words of Him who had "led them by a way they knew not." Ezra's great work was the collection of the parts of revelation into one revised whole. Following history down to the time of Christ, we find it positively asserted that the great writings were accessible to the people. The Jewish Sunday school (the synagogue) had the text-book of divinity. Even in private hands the grand treasure was found, as is shown by the fact that the Ethiopian eunuch read Isaiah before Philip accosted him. "The Man of Galilee" himself, though coming to earth for the great work of redemption, and thereby to institute a new dispensation, gave attendance upon this popular Sabbath school (the synagogue) and by precept and example encouraged the circulation of Scripture truths. His custom was to go

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

on the Sabbath day to the place of worship and of religious study ; and when an occasion was offered him to read the Word publicly, he did it, and gave his views of the meaning. In no way possible to an investigator can it be discovered that the Bible's Author intended any other than the circulation of the truths of Holy Writ in the language of the people to whom the message of salvation was sent.

Studying the New Testament, especially the four Gospels, and inquiring as to the chosen way of sending down to succeeding generations the important narrative of the events that occurred between the shepherd and the magi scene at Bethlehem, and the tragedy of Calvary and succeeding ascension of Jesus of Nazareth, the pious Christian is confronted by circumstances as peculiar in their way of teaching as powerful in their logic for arriving at truth. Following the plan to which attention has been called in the preceding part of this paper, the Divine One gave to human vision enough of actual sight of the miraculous to convince the possessor of physical eyes that the same Jesus whom they saw crucified and buried had risen from the tomb and had ascended heavenward. The commission had been given to carry the news to all nations and to every creature. But those disciples that had seen the Risen Lord and had witnessed his ascension must die like other men. God did not choose to make the then living witnesses immortal as to their bodies on earth. That this was not done by the Omnipotent One is sufficient proof of the un wisdom of such a plan. Nor did he choose to rearrange the millions of worlds in the universe so that the shining stars

## *Jehovah's Mode of Revelation.*

should form themselves into letters and sentences conveying the story of the cross. The same remark made about the plan above will apply here.

Wisdom dictated that man should be the informer of his fellow-man as to the gospel of Christ. The wondering gazers at the scene of the ascension needed no further proof of the wisdom and divinity of the plan of publication than the simple sentence coming from Jesus ascending, which began with the imperative "Go" and ended with the promise, "Lo, I am with you alway."

Evidently, however, there appeared a necessity for trustworthy records of the life and works of our Lord while on earth. As tradition was not sufficient to hand down to after generations the truths of Sinai, so mere tradition was not all that was needed in the case now under consideration. We of the twentieth century can very clearly see how impotent mere tradition would be to convince a thinker, as there are so many so-called traditions that we neither do nor can trust for the truth. Hence we rejoice to take the plan of the All-Wise—viz., that witnesses of the facts should record the facts; and this record should be put upon a par as to sacredness with the venerated Scriptures which the Saviour had recognized as giving prophecies of his own mission. Nor was there a miraculously produced printing press devised for the work of multiplying copies in the primitive Churches. The prevailing mode of making books—that of scription and transcription—was employed; and hence we have the manuscripts of different parts of the New Testament which scholars learned in the original Greek have



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

valued so highly for the purpose of testing the validity of Scripture translations into modern languages. That our Lord saw fit to have the copying done by hand, and did not anticipate the invention of the fifteenth century by miracle, must be ascribed to the will of Deity to use miracle only when requisite for the great purposes of the Divine council chamber.

Thus we see that the original book of Revelation was in manuscript form. Catholic and Protestant scholars know this to be true; and no intelligent priest or layman, certainly no well-informed Protestant, lay or clerical, would say that a translation was an origination of the great Book of books. Not even the Greek Testament when printed can be regarded as the original writing, because the printing process was not known when Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John wrote.

## CHAPTER IV

### CREDIBILITY OF HISTORY GIVEN.

REVELATION being given in the manner we have described as "Jehovah's mode," the inquiry now arises, Are there sufficient evidences within reach of twentieth century thinkers to establish the truth of the history that has come down to us? Have we before our eyes things that cannot admit of any other interpretation than that of acknowledging the truth of evangelistic words? Before attempting to answer this great question, it is entirely proper for us to emphasize its importance by an allusion to the distressing fact that a large part of earth's population may be easily imposed upon by designing demagogues. Because of the multitudes that with apparent zeal have followed erratic and fanatic men—men too entirely governed by ambition or avarice—truth has not always been free to combat error. That is, even in a community democratic enough to claim that dictation of opinion is at once a crime and an absurdity, there are many who so incase themselves in the influence of an erratic leader that they will not listen to the voice of reason or common sense. Truth is not free to enter their minds even for consideration. To such persons the assertion of any fact contrary to their theory in its teaching is so repellent that they at once pronounce it false. Under such influence the atrocities that belonged to the spread of the doctrine of Mahomet were com-

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

mitted. The equally wonderful cruelties that marked some of the fanatic crusaders may be placed in the same category. Even in free America and in a comparatively recent time, sane Christian students have looked with amazement at the numbers of privileged American citizens that seem deluded, if not enslaved, by a theory that has but to be recited to have absurdity and gross immorality stamped upon it. The toils of Congressional or Senatorial committees have been pregnant with sad but thorough argument on this subject; but the advocate of truth should not be discouraged by the fact. The greater the multitude opposed to the plan of the true salvation, the louder the voice of its herald should be sounded. The more men desire to close their ears to the arguments of true reason, the more should true reasoners ply their logic.

On the other hand, the claims of men of genius to freedom of opinion, and their consequent opposition to all dogmatic teaching, may constitute a serious difficulty in the way of the herald of true Christian dogma; but this fact only adds force to the importance of the question above, and should stimulate effort for an appropriate answer. Men of much capability, disgusted at the tyranny exercised over the human mind by the leaders of the deluded citizens aforesaid, have given currency to an idea that, we fear, has by its abuse done much harm to mortal immortals. That idea is found in the supposed right of private opinion.

The notion of taking a creed from the dictation of a fellow-mortal is indeed justly execrated. Especially is this true when the items in the creed are manifestly in the interest of the person dictating and against the

## *Credibility of History Given.*

preference of the recipient. Neither greater cruelty nor more inexcusable tyranny has ever characterized a sovereign than that exercise of authority which said to a mental being: "Take a dogma which I offer, unreasonable as you consider it, or go to the iron stake to be burned." No wonder that great minds have resisted such an assumption of power and contended for mental freedom as an inherent right, meaning thereby that one's own mental power must search for truth and formulate creed. On matters of the highest importance no responsible free agent should consent that his thinking be done by proxy.

But the abuse of a thoroughly sound and wise sentiment is the danger of our race. In the matter under consideration men have taken the unholy notion that they have a right to any opinion, no matter how that opinion was reached, or that they have such a right without any examination into facts. By simply asserting that an opinion is their own, they claim a right thereto, though no real mental toil has preceded. Not truth, but personal preference or taste, has been the object of inquiry. The doctrine would lead to the enormity that a judicial murder was not criminal because the tribunal came to an opinion though no evidence had been examined. It would ultimate in the notion that a chemist has the right to deny the constituents of air or water provided he fails to experiment. After all, it is investigation to which mind has a right. Opinion or judgment must have the toil of thoughtful examination as its parent; otherwise, the owner can have no right to its possession. Let the truth be honestly sought, and then let it be as

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

honestly proclaimed, and the God of truth may be trusted for good results.

That class of men who carry the matter of personal liberty or of private opinion so far as to seem to intimate that a moral agent may have a right to do a wrong provided he claims it as his opinion, although by a little inquiry he could see the wrong, must, in the present condition of our world, constitute as great a difficulty to the progress of true religion as that to which attention was called by naming the deluded followers of erratic fanatics.

This truth, however, adds additional evidence to the importance of the question we have raised, and calls for honest and industrious work to know the situation of things now before the eyes of civilized man, and what influence they have upon the evidential statements made in regard to the truth of the history we study, and also in reference to the relative value of "versions."

Returning, then, to the study of the question noted, the searcher for truth in the matter of credible history may call attention first to the existence of a people called Jews, and may confidently challenge the learning of the world to give any account of their origin or history other than that contained in the books called by Israelites "The Scriptures;" which books, originally in Hebrew, were by the order of Ptolemy Philadelphus translated into Greek, the literary work being done by seventy of the best scholars known at the time to the Egyptian monarch. It is needless here to do more than to name this fact, and leave it for

## *Credibility of History Given.*

thought as sufficient to corroborate the Old Testament writings now printed in our Bible.

The next great fact upon which testimony is asked is the resurrection of Christ from the dead. If the Saviour rose from the tomb after three days of burial, all other miracles recorded by the evangelists are surely established. The crowning act of Omnipotence is the seal of the whole Messianic work, both as to the acceptance of the finished plan on the part of Nature's ruler and its value as sufficient proof to man of his welcome to comforting assurance. No human soul needs to be afflicted with doubt as to the Saviour's willingness to pardon and save, if that soul cordially accepts the truth of the resurrection.

Now that Peter and John as well as all the other favored ones who looked upon the risen Jesus had the demonstration of the physical senses to the great miraculous fact is clear. St. John closes his Gospel with the positive assertion of the knowledge of the truths which he had written and to which he gave personal testimony. In his first Epistle, also, he speaks of that which his eyes had seen and his hands had handled of the word of life. Evidently no story originating in carnal hatred and circulated by the bribed soldiers could obtain credence among the men who had such positive knowledge. The story paid for by the money of the Jews bore evidence of its own falsehood; for if the soldiers were so sound asleep as not to be aroused by the egress of the body from the tomb, they could not possibly be witnesses to a theft; but if they were awake, they knew that death awaited them if they allowed a theft.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

Equally void of sound reason and good sense must be the theory at one time supposed to be adopted by some German thinkers to the effect that the recorded interviews of the disciples with their risen Master were not real but visionary. The supposition is coolly put forth that not an optical fact but an optical illusion constituted the foundation of the bold speeches and bold writings of the followers of Jesus. In other words, a ghost story is by these gentlemen put upon a par with the testimony of John and Peter as to the truth of the resurrection. The learned inventors of this wonderful idea seemed to forget that the vacant tomb was a sufficient refutation of the charge of illusion, saying nothing of the folly of supposing that largely over five hundred persons should have had an identical exercise of a morbid imagination.

These critics also seemed to ignore the fact that the guarding of the sepulcher was placed in the hands of the enemies of the man claiming to be the Son of God. If an optical illusion was all that belonged to the story of the rejoicing pupils of the Man of Galilee, the real body was still in the possession of those that desired above all things a refutation of gospel testimony. How eagerly they would have seized the opportunity to produce the corpse with the pierced side and nail-marked hands, in order to silence forever the claims of fanatic preaching! The absence of such a showing on the part of the erewhile guardians of Christ's body is sufficient to show the folly of the reasoning to which allusion has been made.

The intelligent and honest investigator as to the origin of the English versions of the great book called

## *Credibility of History Given.*

the Bible must accept as historic the account given in Hebrew and Greek manuscripts written by the men that were eyewitnesses of the facts; and the same lover of truth must, by stern, uncompromising logic, reject the suppositions of skeptical minds proposing any theory of interpretation which tries to make the plain statements either visionary or fraudulent. All history, as well as that of Holy Writ, must be thrown into the mist of doubt by the intellect that will adopt either the visionary or the fraudulent theory. The tragedy of Cæsar's death and the narrative of Napoleon's St. Helena home could hardly be taken as actually true by such a specimen of mental existence. History is regarded as authentic when a large number of writers contemporary with the events narrated give testimony to the same effect. Especially is this true when the writers write from different standpoints and from different motives; and, it may be added, more especially is this rule trustworthy when the things testified are climactic and epochal, revolutionizing nationalities and changing the entire course of civilized society.

Nor do the historians of the present age reject as untrue those incidents recorded by former historians so remarkable as to have nothing of a similar character in the experience of the present age. The same remark may be made in reference to the writers of the eighteenth century.

Even David Hume in writing English history ignores the doctrine of his celebrated essay, and affirms as historic the burning of Cranmer, of Ridley, and of Latimer, as well as of others, for their religious views



## *Donay or New York, Which?*

—facts entirely contrary to what expectation or experience of the men of his time would call for. This renowned author and gifted thinker seemed (when he wrote the story of Henry VIII. and that of his daughter Mary) to lay aside his philosophic dictum: “It is more in accord with experience that testimony should be false than that a miracle should be true; therefore miraculous history must be untrue.”

The remarkable thing about this matter is that so astute a mind did not seem to recognize the contradiction between his essays and his history. We have only to substitute the words “unnatural” and “wonderful” for the words “miracle” and “miraculous” in the aforesaid dictum to show the fallacy. Certainly nothing could appear more unnatural and contrary to the experience of Englishmen in recent centuries than the deeds of Henry VIII. in murdering so many wives, and those of his daughter Mary in burning good men.

From all the preceding lines we are obliged to admit that the manuscript history left by the apostle John and others was known to be true history in the first century by those who witnessed the wonderful and merciful transactions. The manuscripts are entitled to the appellation “historic” by all the rules that admit to the pages of reliability Xenophon’s story of the “Anabasis,” or the words of Seneca, Tacitus, and Pliny as to the condition of Roman affairs. But the question we have raised as to the ocular demonstration remains unanswered. Do the perceptive faculties of the present age through the organs of vision observe any facts that compel the admission of truth in the history given by St. John? Do the Scripture

## *Credibility of History Given.*

narratives give a superabundance of proof undiscovered in the story of Cæsar and that of Napoleon? We answer that the manner chosen by the Saviour for handing down to the generations following the actuality of his sacrificial atonement seems the climax of logical wisdom. No pile of marble or granite could be as effectual for convincing the reason of the thinker. The pyramids of Egypt and the Stonehenge of Salisbury Plain in England fail to tell their own origin or purpose; but when Jesus of Nazareth gave the ordinances of his Church and in reference to one of them said, "This do in remembrance of me," he selected a mode of handing down through the ages an actual occurrence that may well defy imposture. The celebration of the sacrament is month after month before the gaze of men. Through all the changes in ecclesiastical organization, through all the revolutions of the political world, the simple plan of our blessed Lord has come down to us in all its reasoning efficiency, as uncontradicted in its assertion of fact as merciful in its gospel offers. If an imposture, there was a beginning of the imposition, and the impostors must have had a narrative to tell of the reason for the observance of the ceremony. That story must have embraced things similar to what scholars find in the manuscripts to which we have adverted.

Nor can the skeptical intellect fix upon a period of time subsequent to the apostolic age at which such a narrative could have been imposed upon the men of that time without an absurd contradiction of both mental and physical vision; for there would have been a call for the assertion to the men of that period that

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

they themselves had been in the habit of doing the very thing the impostors wished to introduce. To make this plain, suppose the following diagram be presented to the eye, and the squares marked 1, 2, 3, 4 represent periods of time ("1" being put for the time of St. John's narrative, "2" for the generation following, and "3" and "4" for subsequent times) :

1	2	3	4
---	---	---	---

Now if no Saviour rose and no Church was instituted, suppose an impostor to arise in the period marked "4" asserting there was such a resurrection in the period marked "1," and that he proposed to celebrate a commemoration which had come down through "2" and "3," and had never failed of being observed; is it not plain that the reply of the people would be: "We have never seen or heard of such a sacrament, and you contradict the testimony of our eyes and of our memory?" The same showing of the absurdity of supposing that an imposition of the kind could be made in "3" or "2" will be easy to the thoughtful, because in each case the impostor would be necessitated to assert that the people had seen what they knew they had not seen. But if the supposition be that the imposture took place in "1," the idea is immediately grasped that the impossibility of deception is readily seen by the nonproduction of Christ's body by those who had charge thereof before the resurrection and by the actual eyesight of enough witnesses to the risen Saviour to storm the intellect of an inquirer.

## *Credibility of History Given.*

If it be objected that the Olympic games might be brought forward to argue that the myth of Olympus was a truth, the reply is ready to the effect that the myth was current in Greece long before the establishment of the games, and that the latter made no claim to the testimony of being at the birth of the myth. They performed their mission in giving testimony as to their own beginning, but nothing as to the truth or falsity of Olympic mythology. The argument originally given by Mr. Lesley and quoted by Richard Watson requires that the celebration of a matter of fact should have begun or have been instituted at the time of the matter of fact, and this was the case with the Church and her ordinances.

Thus Catholics and Protestants are brought most certainly to the acknowledgment of the truthfulness of the evangelists in their writings about the resurrection and ascension of the God-man ; but with equal certainty they must see that all true history of "the versions" must go back to the original writings in a language vernacular at the time of the apostles, but now considered dead so far as popular use is concerned.

No less must all honest searchers for truth assert that the value of a translation must be in proportion to fidelity in giving the meaning of the original authors of the book translated.

In view of the facts and the argument based thereupon showing so conclusively the validity of the Scripture record found in the language used in the Augustan age, which facts have been named in the former paragraphs of this writing, it must appear as

## *Donay or New York, Which?*

remarkable as absurd that an advocate of a version should claim greater antiquity of teaching for his volume than for that of another translator, when the real history of the doctrine of both books must begin with the date of the original manuscript taken by each party as authoritative. This statement appears more forcible when the language of both translations, so nearly akin when taken apart from comment, is considered; and it is seen that the same great truths are brought into modern reading by both translators. Let, then, a fair and unbiased examination of history be made in reference to some prominent translations of the sacred text.

## CHAPTER V.

### THE RHEIMS-DOUAY VERSION.

THE edition of this version of the Scriptures published by the John Murphy Company (and having note of approval from Cardinal Gibbons, dated Baltimore, September 1, 1899) has on the title-page the following: "The Holy Bible translated from the Latin Vulgate diligently compared with the Hebrew, Greek, and other editions in divers languages. The old Testament first published by the English college at Douay A.D. 1609, and the New Testament first published by the English college at Rheims A.D. 1582, with annotations, references, and a historical and chronological index, the whole revised and diligently compared with the Latin Vulgate."

From this title-page, as well as from historical data, we are warranted in the supposition that the Vulgate translation made by St. Jerome about A.D. 395 was the guiding text for the Douay translators.

Jerome was for three years in Rome with Pope Damasus (A.D. 382-385), at whose wish he undertook the great work of producing a copy of the Scriptures in the Latin language. There were some Latin versions before Jerome's work, but none satisfactory to the Pope or to the erudite visitor to Damasus. The work of Jerome was prosecuted with much earnestness, and no doubt both honesty of purpose and critical scholarship gave to the resultant

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

Vulgate Scriptures their great value to subsequent toilers in sacred literature.

The first undertaking was with regard to the New Testament, completed A.D. 395.

About four or five years after the New Testament had been translated into Latin by the toiler named, the same indefatigable linguist completed the translation of the Old Testament. He used, no doubt, two sources of information from which to secure correctness of wording. The first was the Greek Septuagint; the second was, as we suppose, the Hebrew manuscripts accessible to the investigator. It is recorded of Jerome that he began the study of Hebrew about A.D. 374, and subsequently wrote several treatises connected with his work of acquiring the language. We may rest assured that he made due use of what he gained from perusing "Moses and the Prophets" in the original tongue.

At any rate, the Old and the New Testaments combined, and afterwards called "The Vulgate," constituted a literary achievement highly appreciated by the scholars of subsequent centuries. It can hardly be questioned that persons of the fourth century, using the Latin language as vernacular and reading seriously and carefully the Vulgate Bible, would get the true ideas of Holy Writ on all subjects connected with the plan of salvation and man's duty thereunder; and this result would be acquired though the reader knew not a word of Greek or Hebrew. The changes made by St. Jerome from the previous Latin Scriptures were such as he thought necessary to bring the text nearer to the meaning of the original languages. In

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

performing his work he seems to have endeavored to keep as far as possible to a strict rule of verbal exactness, disregarding sometimes the known differences in the idioms of the Greek and Latin tongues. Hence it may be that errors which critics have charged upon the version arose from his conscientious endeavor to be verbally exact. Translations from one language to another of different idiomatic expressions must necessarily employ some words that were understood but not actually employed in the original. Take, for example, the well-known rule of Latin grammars to the effect that after verbs of thinking, hearing, saying, etc., the subject of the subordinate clause is put in the accusative and the verb in the infinitive; then, in bringing the compound sentence into English, the scholar is directed to supply "that" in the translation.

In the Greek language, however, the participle *ὅτι* is frequently used to introduce subordinate sentences, though the accusative before the infinitive is also used. The difference in the two idioms is simply that the one language employs only one mode, while the other has two ways of introducing the sentence after the verbs of thinking, saying, etc. It is also known that the Greek word *ὅτι* has (in addition to its objective meaning "that") very frequently a causal force, and means "because." The text of Matthew ii. 22 is put in the Vulgate so as to make the meaning appear quite different from what the Douay and the King James Versions give. The Latin word *quia* is in the Vulgate, and means "because," making the sentence to read in English: "But hearing *because* Archelaus reigned in Judea," etc. Beza's Latin Testament has



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

*"Quum autem audisset Archelaum regnare in Judea,"* etc., which in King James's Version is correctly rendered, "But when he heard *that* Archelaus did reign in Judea," etc. And this is evidently the meaning of the Greek, but the word "that" is understood, not expressed, in the Latin. Similar criticism of the Vulgate may be made with regard to Matthew ii. 16, where ἰδὼν ὅτι is translated *videns quoniam*, where Beza has *Quum vidisset se*, etc., and the English, "When he saw that," etc. There are in the Vulgate many similar translations, all, no doubt, due to the desire to conform to the exact form of the Greek text.

This view of Jerome's work seems to have been adopted by the majority of scholars in the present age. One learned man writes as follows: "Such are some of the characteristics of the Vulgate appearing from an examination of a portion of one of the Gospels. Its excellences are great and marvelous, and even its defects, generally arising from a scrupulous desire to keep close to the side of the sacred original, often suggest or confirm points of the gravest importance. Professor Lachman, Professor Tischendorf, and Dr. Tragelless, the three greatest names connected with the textual criticism of the Greek Testament in recent times, adopting the view of the learned Bentley, regarded the Latin in the purest and most ancient form as the most important witness to the integrity of the New Testament, next to the Greek manuscript; nor did they fail to observe that the Latin in some phases goes back to a period which no Greek manuscript now extant represents." (Charles Short, in Johnson's *Cyclopedia*.)

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

From all the reliable sources of information now available, we learn that Jerome honestly and earnestly sought to give to the Latin world a true version of the Holy Bible, desiring that the common people should have access to the teachings that come from the lips of Him who "spake as never man spake." It is said of this saint that he collated many Greek manuscripts, and these were those coming as near to apostolic times as any then or now known, in order to get at the true readings of Christ's words. He also copied some manuscripts to enrich his own library.

A new translation, designed to supersede a version long revered, generally meets with opposition. The Vulgate constituted no exception; it met with violent opposition. Even so learned a man as St. Augustine disapproved or discouraged the work. The average mind seemed to prefer the older translation with its errors to any new work of scholarship. To many, perhaps, the attempt to remove error by giving words more nearly the exact meaning of the Greek original seemed next to sacrilege.

The perseverance, however, of the scholar and the sympathy of the Roman ecclesiastics ultimately succeeded in making the Vulgate the *textus receptus* of the Latin Church, and on through the centuries, during the time sometimes criticised as the "Dark Ages," it was used in public worship. At the Council of Trent, in the sixteenth century, a formal decree was made to the effect that Jerome's work should be the standard authority for biblical language. But it is equally true that before the invention of the art of printing, and because all increase in the number of copies was

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

dependent on the copyists, many verbal errors had crept into the book; so that at the period when the great theological controversies heralded what has since been known as "the Reformation," there seemed to be an imperative need for careful revision. This was recognized even at the Vatican, in Rome, and hence Pope Sextus Quintus, A.D. 1590, undertook to have such a work performed. In regard to this undertaking we find in history the following record—viz.: "Though declared by the pontiff *authentic and in a manner absolutely perfect*, it contained such typographical and other errors as to compel a second and revised edition in A.D. 1592, of another in 1593, and still another in 1598, with a triple list of errata, one for each of the preceding editions. This is the standard of the Vulgate or Roman Catholic Bible of the present day." (See Johnson's "Encyclopedia," Vol. VIII., p. 570.)

The use made of the Vulgate Scriptures by the earlier English translators was, no doubt, almost controlling. Wyclif, over two hundred years before the date of the King James Version, and about the same number of years before the date of the Douay translation, seemed to consider the Vulgate as his guide. The scholars appointed by King James (A.D. 1611) to give to the English-speaking world what has been called the Authorized Version, by no means neglected the Vulgate as one of the main sources of information. The authority previously noted has these words: "When the Vulgate was turned into its earliest English form, the Anglo-Saxon Version, it was hardly possible that this act should not have greatly modified

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

our language by introducing new words, mostly religious, and by giving us new forms of construction; and again, this work would be carried farther by the Wyclifite version, and was perhaps nearly consummated in the Rheims, the last great version that preceded our own. Our Christian nomenclature itself has thus in great measure been furnished to us by the Vulgate, and many of these precious words were either invented in Latin or there first used in their higher and spiritual sense, such as *regeneration*, *conversion*, *justification*, *sanctification*, *predestination*, *election*, *propitiation*, *reconciliation*, *Saviour*, *salvation*, *Redeemer*, *redemption*, *mediator*, *spirit*, *cross*, *faith*, *grace*, *revelation*, *inspiration*, *Scripture*, *Testament*, *communion*, *orders*, *congregation*; some words are Greek, but given to us through the Latin, as *baptism*, *Paraclete*, and *presbyter* or *priest*; while some were coined in Latin to copy the Greek, as *transgress* from *transgredior* in imitation of *ὑπερβαίνω*. If we say, as we may with truth, that Christianity in the first instance was received in the Greek language and through Greek thought, we may surely say that it was adopted in Europe chiefly in Latin forms; and the influence of the Vulgate upon the religious language, thought, and culture of Europe can hardly be overestimated. See Canon Westcott, Dr. Tregelles, Horne's "Introduction to the Scriptures," Vol. IV., and many other authors and critics." (Johnson's Cyclo-pedia, Vol. VIII., p. 572.)

We have thus given the position of Protestant and Catholic scholars upon the real value of St. Jerome's work for two reasons: First, because of its being the

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

parent of the Douay Version, whose history we wish to write; and, secondly, because it is desirable that Catholic readers should know that Protestant translators, if not claiming the same paternity for their versions, are not slow to acknowledge a very near kinship of origin, and to give all due credit to the great work of the canonized toiler in sacred literature. To these reasons may be added the remark that both Catholic and Protestant linguists must see that there were linguistic mistakes even in the Vulgate, and that a translation that would avoid these mistakes while retaining all the value of the Vulgate would benefit the world. The great motive for all Christians should be to search out and adopt the true words of our Divine Master, the Saviour of the world. Nor should the ardent desire to give to the masses of the world's population the very best translation of God's Word ever be absent from the mind and heart of a Christian scholar engaged in Scripture study.

Up to and during the fourteenth century but little had been done by literary men to popularize the reading of the Holy Scriptures—*i. e.*, from the date of St. Jerome's Latin translation. It may well be supposed that every copy of the sacred writings found in cloister, convent, or church was in a language unknown to the masses of earth's toiling millions; for the Latin gradually, during the decline and fall of the Roman Empire, ceased to be vernacular in any portion of the world, and hence the valuable toil of Jerome was known only to the comparatively narrow circle of what were called classic scholars and ecclesiastical priests. Perhaps as early as the latter part

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

of the fifth century few of the common people could read, speak, or write Latin. Germany, France, England, Spain, Portugal, and even Italy needed a translation from Latin into the vernacular if their varied inhabitants desired to read Holy Writ for themselves, and not be dependent upon the reading of another in an unknown tongue.

Attendance upon public worship could by no means give relief to the soul anxious to know the words of the Saviour; for the ritual was in a dead language, of which the layman knew nothing. The reading of lessons from the Vulgate Bible could enlighten no one ignorant of the Latin words. All due honor should be given to the Catholic Church for the great service done to the Christian world by the preservation of the manuscripts of the Scriptures during the ages when mind seemed to slumber and the twin evils of ignorance and vice had such a large sway over humanity. The wonder is that for so many centuries these manuscripts were left untranslated for the general public, and hence their great mission was so long delayed. The intelligent Catholic and Protestant of the twentieth century must alike marvel that during a thousand years the enterprise of giving the Word of God to the multitude had so few advocates. The zeal of Jerome seemed to have no imitators, and the injunctions of Christ to be forgotten. The few so-called schoolmen of mediæval times, careful to exhibit their learning and peculiar logic in the vain discussions of nominalism and realism, seemed to care nothing for the dense stupidity or vicious inclinations that had captured the souls of men.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

Sadly, too, the good ecclesiastic of the present age must admit that, unless Catholic and Protestant have each given to the world a false history, the evils of which we speak were not confined to the lower classes of the population in any country during the fourteenth century. If learning to some degree existed among kings, princes, and nobles, it was a learning that made no attempt to banish chicanery and fraud from business or political life. Taking English kings as types of the upper classes of men in general at that day, we can give, as a type of the types, Richard II., who, when alarmed at the revolt of the peasants, made very good promises to the assembled multitudes; but as soon as the poor people had dispersed trusting to the written charters they had secured, and as soon as Richard found himself at the head of an army of forty thousand men, the same mouth that had made those fair promises gave to the charter holders the words that historians have recorded as the worth of a king's word: "Villeins you were and villeins you are. In bondage you shall abide; and that not your old bondage, but a worse."

Nor can the most ardent Christian and defender "of the faith once delivered to the saints" deny the testimony of the most reliable historians to the effect that corruption of morals reached to the highest places in ecclesiastical authority and influence.

While Richard was disgracing the English throne by falsity to his word given under the most solemn circumstances, and while his successor, Henry IV., was engaged in forming decrees which made the fire and the stake to constitute the means of torture and

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

death to those who would not abjure what they believed to be the truth of God, events were taking place in Rome and Florence which proved at once the degradation in morals and the ecclesiastical power of bad men in high place in the Church. Boniface IX. was Pope at Rome, A.D. 1389-1404. History, so far as we know uncontradicted, records of him: "He exceeded all his predecessors in the continued sale of ecclesiastical offices and benefices and of dispensations and indulgences. He acquired after a struggle a most absolute power in Rome, which he kept in awe by fortresses." Innocent VII. (1404-1406) was chosen amid the troubles of the great schism, so that little is said of his reign except that it was marked by the indiscretion of nepotism. Gregory XII. (1406-1415) made no sufficient efforts, so far as we can judge, to purify the moral atmosphere. The popes from this date on toward the close of the fifteenth century were either unable or unwilling to accomplish any moral reform of great significance or to stop the downward trend, until in 1492 the climax of wickedness was reached by the exaltation of Alexander VI., one of the infamous Borgia family, whose members, however different in mind or body, seemed all to agree in the one characteristic of unscrupulous moral depravity.

Florence passed through a varied history during the fourteenth century. The family of the Medici obtained power in 1378. The growth of vice in that family seemed equal to the growth in wealth. Lorenzo the Magnificent gave to the world a history as execrable as wonderful. Savonarola came into the



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

world in 1452. He was at the early age of twenty an advocate of moral reform. Shocked at the immoralities of the age, he entered a convent; but after seven years of retiracy, he was sent to Florence to exercise his gifts as priest and preacher. His burning eloquence and powerful denunciations of sin won for him the hatred of Alexander VI., the Borgian Pope, and of the civil ruler, Lorenzo the Magnificent. Each offered him a bribe to secure his silence; but neither a cardinal's hat from the Pope nor a largess from the civil ruler was successful to close the mouth of the heroic priest. After the death of Lorenzo, the successor of that prince seemed no less to desire the crushing out of such preaching as had given offense; and, all other means failing, the resolve was formed that Savonarola must die. The arrest, the hanging, the burning of the body, and the throwing of the ashes into the Arno are recorded in the pages of history to be continued testimony of the depths of iniquity that prevailed in high places in Church and State. The Church is included, because it is said that Florence was threatened with an interdict by the Pope if the troublesome friar was not silenced.

A number of years before the Arno was thus unwittingly hallowed, the waters of the Rhine had received a martyr's ashes. John Huss and Jerome of Prague were condemned by the Council of Constance (A.D. 1414), burned at the stake, and their ashes thrown into the river—for what? So far as we can gather from the best historians, no crime was charged other than that of daring to give the results of their study of Holy Writ, which results differed from the tenets

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

of the authorities at the Vatican. In the case of Huss, too, the martyrdom was in direct violation of what was called a "safe conduct" from a German emperor (Sigismund), which expressly promised Huss that he should safely return to Bohemia, his home (*ut saluus ad Bohemiam rediret*). In conniving at or consenting to this shameful procedure, the Emperor placed himself along with Richard II., of England, in showing "the worth of a monarch's word" in those times.

It is manifestly wrong to charge upon any society the disapproved wrongs of individual members, nor can it be called strict justice to criminate a whole community because of the wickedness of ruling tyrants; but when a nation or a Church of free choice will place men known to be of the very lowest morals in seats of authority, then moralists need not be slow to place the blame, and hence to declare the wickedness in high places exponential of national or ecclesiastical morality. It is equally true that when no protest is made against a disgraceful policy the aphorism, "Silence gives consent," will be fairly applied; and still another remark may be pertinent here—viz., when a man daring enough to speak out against known wrongs has to lose his life by the most torturing of all modes of life-taking for no other deed than that of an honest protest against depraved morals, surely the true thinker *must* be approved when he characterizes such a crime as a national or ecclesiastical disgrace.

Upon such principles as the foregoing, we have given as evidences of moral character the deplorable historic incidents occurring in England, in Rome, in Florence, and in Constance; and it is also desired to

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

show that the change of policy in the Roman Catholic Church with reference to giving the people a Bible in the vernacular tongue did not come too soon. The wonder is that so long a time was allowed to intervene between the atrocity at Florence or at Constance and the work of the scholars at Rheims or Douay. That the cry for light was unheeded by the Church for a century or more must be as discreditable as mysterious. That the cry existed is shown by the fact that Wyclif was roused to the consideration of a great need during the fourteenth century, and undertook to translate the Vulgate Scriptures into the English language. The effect that translation had on the people of England was remarkable. Had the authorities, civil and ecclesiastical, taken hold of the enterprise during Wyclif's lifetime and by a proper system of schools shown to the people that the Church and civil government desired the emancipation of mind from the shackles of ignorance on earth and the salvation of the soul at last in heaven, how different would have been the story of the English monarchy! But as we have that story now, how great a call for tears when the reader of history is unable to study the records of any of the years from Richard II. to James I. (a period of over two centuries) without having before him a picture of human degradation and suffering at once appalling and criminal! Crime is *somewhere* when oppression is *anywhere*; and students of history will not be slow to locate the crime when they read the description of the oppression. Whoever the man or woman was that contributed to the perpetuation of ignorance and selfishness by bar-

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

ring the masses from the great fountain of truth, the Word of God, must be a contributor to oppression of the human soul and a violator of human rights. If the person "that has done this deed" be king, emperor, priest, cardinal, or pope, where the actor is found, the criminal is discovered. If it be Alexander VI., Julius II., or Leo X., in the papal chair, or Lorenzo the Magnificent, Sigismund of Germany, or Henry IV of England, in the chair of state, let no enlightened Catholic or Protestant attempt a defense. The deed is one of so great enormity that no attorney at law would in the present year of our Lord undertake to defend it, no matter how large the fee, unless he were willing to barter reputation for filthy lucre. The words of Jesus of Nazareth should have made impression upon those who burned the books of Holy Writ when Wyclif tried to give them to the people. In Luke xi. 52 we find: "Woe unto you doctors of the law; for ye took away the key of knowledge; yourselves did not enter, and those entering ye hindered."

St. Peter, in his celebrated speech on the day of Pentecost, said: "The promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off." What promise did he mean? Evidently, from the foregoing part of his speech, he meant the promise of salvation by faith. The Lord of St. Peter had prayed to the Father: "Sanctify them through thy truth; thy word is truth." How it was that an English king, professedly allied to an ecclesiastical system whose principal officer claimed to succeed St. Peter in giving the words of the Saviour to endangered men, could find it in his heart to threaten and persecute the man who placed the

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

Sacred Text within the mental reach of the waiting people must remain unexplained except by hypothesis, until the final marshaling of moral agents before the great white throne shall call the doctors of the law to whom Christ alluded to give an account of the deeds done in the body.

Wyclif was once powerful in influence in Oxford University; but when it was discovered by Archbishop Courtenay (about A.D. 1376) that the writings of Wyclif seemed to oppose the policy of the papal authorities, that prelate entered upon a fierce persecution, having for its object the silencing of such preaching and the expulsion of such literature from the university. Parties were formed, many students favoring the noted translator. Perhaps Wyclif's noble work would have gained a large circulation had not the Crown interfered to favor Courtenay, and given governmental authority to an order banishing all favorers of Wyclif and commanding the destruction of the books called "Lollard," which term, of course, included the English Bible. The record of history is to the effect that "the suppression of Lollardism was complete, but with the death of religious freedom all trace of intellectual life suddenly disappeared. The century that followed the triumph of Courtenay is the most barren in the university's history; nor was the sleep of the university broken till the advent of the new learning restored to it some of the life and liberty which the primate had so roughly trodden out." It is proper to say here that Pope Gregory VI., by his bulls issued in A.D. 1377, showed his approval of the acts of king and primate.

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

The hypothesis to which allusion was made in the foregoing remarks cannot be complimentary to the morals of what was called Christendom in the age when Wyclif toiled. That hypothesis must be that the ruling powers were opposed to the circulation of an English version of the Scriptures because a knowledge of Christ's words would expose the corruptions which existed in Italy and in England. History records the following: "The writings of contemporary scholars, preachers, and satirists are full of complaints and exposures of the ignorance, vulgarity, and immorality of priests and monks. Simony and nepotism were shamefully practiced. Celibacy was a foul fountain of unchastity and uncleanness." What could the world think when even a pope of the Borgian family claimed a numerous progeny, the members of which he promoted to remunerative offices without regard to qualification for the duties thereof! All this, too, was in violation of the vows of celibacy which, of course, had been taken when entering the priesthood.

Two great errors had grown into popularity in this age. The first was that the pope at the head of the Church properly claimed more authority than the written word. The second is found in the notion that pains and penalties, reaching even to the infliction of death, could be justly ordered upon men by ecclesiastical and civil authority for differing in opinion from the papacy. The suppression of Wyclif's publications, as we have shown, was contributory to a continuance of these errors, until in the days of Henry VIII. and his children persecution raged, culminating in the fires of Smithfield when Ridley, Latimer, Rogers,

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

and a host of others paid the penalty in flaming tortures for daring to deny certain dogmas. (See Appendix, Note A.)

We cannot believe that any class of professing Christians, Catholic or other, in the present age, can approve of the death warrants issued by Queen Mary Tudor. These cruelties under the name of religion were sufficient to rouse the human mind against tyranny, and hence to favor the Reformation under Luther and his coadjutors. Translations of the Bible into the German and English languages followed, until, under James I., what is still called the Accepted or Authorized Version was produced.

During the disturbances occurring in England mainly in the sixteenth century certain Catholic refugees established themselves at Rheims and Douay, in France. To them were given by the Catholic authorities two colleges, one at Rheims and one at Douay. The Pope at Rome saw that something must be done to satisfy sincere Catholics as to an English translation of the Bible, and hence he employed the scholars of these colleges to give to the Catholic world a translation of Holy Writ; but with the injunction that the text should be accompanied by notes or comments that should meet with papal approval. Here we have an account of the origin of what has for three hundred years been known as the Douay Bible. The long-delayed work was done, part at Rheims (A.D. 1582) and part at Douay (A.D. 1609).

That many persons in that age and in this should look upon the Douay Bible as an effect and not a cause of the Reformation in the century giving it birth

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

cannot be considered wonderful. The change in the policy at Rome was remarkable, but critics were not slow to aver that the publication from Douay would never have been made had not the Protestants, with greater success than that which attended Wyclif's effort, given the words of Jesus in English; just as Luther's German Bible had made the Roman scholars give their German version with notes. (See Note B, Appendix; also B<sup>1</sup>)

That such criticism should be made can hardly be called an unreasonable process of mind; for every need of a translation that existed in 1609 must have been fact when the suppression of Wyclif's publication was so lamentably successful. Nor did that need appear less at any time in the long years from Henry IV. (1409) to James I. (1609). With equal certainty may it be asserted that there was ability enough both to know the need and to supply the literary work; only the willingness was lacking. The moral and intellectual degradation of the great mass of the human family in the time of which we speak must have been known to the cardinals and popes who held the sacred word from the common people. Perhaps history does not record the story of any age more deeply imbued with both ignorance and crime. Learning was confined to the few among nobles or priests, while the multitude had no light of literature or of revelation. The picture drawn by Mr. Froude relative to Rome in the time of Cæsar's murder may well have its counterpart in the representation of almost any decade in the two centuries under consideration, except that the cloud of mental darkness in the latter was greater than



## *Donay or New York, Which?*

that of the former; the vices among the supposedly learned were about the same in the two pictures. Mr. Froude says: "Their oaths [as Roman Senators] were nothing to them. If they were entitled to kill Cæsar, they were entitled equally to deceive him. No stronger evidence is needed of the demoralization of the Roman Senate than the completeness with which the Senators were able to disguise from themselves the baseness of their treachery." We add to the historian's words the reflection—viz., What else but scenes of blood or of burning such as were exhibited under Nero or Caligula could be expected to follow such senatorial corruption? (See Note C, Appendix.)

In like manner the thought is forced upon the moralist of the present day—viz., What but the scenes of burning exhibited at Constance, at Florence, and on the plains of Smithfield could be expected from the vices that prevailed in high places and the ignorance that was found in the low, during the darkest times of historic narrative?

If history is "philosophy teaching by examples," the student of philosophy must learn that shrewdness in a cultivated intellect is not always the producer of virtuous actions. If ignorance and vice are usually wedded, there is no proof that learning and vice are always divorced. Some of the most heinous crimes have been committed by men of large intellectual power. It is when culture has as its concomitant a thorough enforcement of the principles of virtue taught in the "Sermon on the Mount" that mankind can expect large benefit from the acquisition of knowledge. Communities may advance in a kind of learn-

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

ing and at the same time progress in wickedness; but no community ever advanced in learning along with a thorough insistence upon the philosophy of Sinai and the instructions of the Man of Galilee, that did not make large progress in good morals, excellent virtues, religious characteristics, and hence in happiness.

In view of these truths the Christian thinker, holding in reverence the words of Jesus, must be permitted to condemn most thoroughly the policy that kept the common people away from the knowledge of those words for so many years; and it is difficult to find fault with the same thinker for a criticism such as we have named when he asserts that, so far as he knows, there was no condemnation given from the Vatican of the cruel purpose (theretofore so plainly entertained at Rome) when the Douay Bible was printed. On the contrary, the notes appended to the text, coupled with the prohibition of the reading of an English version without papal notes, can hardly be taken in any sense but that of approval of the policy aforesaid. But whether willingly or unwillingly done, the work was accomplished and the Christian world now has to do with its character. Was it, and is it, well calculated to give to its readers the words of the Redeemer in such a way as to convey Christ's ideas in answer to the question: "What must a man do to be saved?" To answer this very important question with justice to the workers at Rheims and at Douay, and at the same time with fairness to the reading world and without endangering any human soul, one must look closely at the translation of the

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

text and at the notes appended. It is generally supposed that the notes were designed to have equal authority and influence with the text, because they constituted mandates as to how the reader was to understand the text. Hence the absence of a note is permission to understand the text according to reason or common sense. Looking at the epitome of the gospel as given in John iii. 16, we find the Douay translation to be: "For God so loved the world as to give his only-begotten Son; that whosoever believeth in him may not perish but may have everlasting life." The use of "may" instead of "should" will not vitiate the grand idea that the Saviour intended to give to Nicodemus; and there is no note appended. Consequently a seeker of religious peace opening the Douay edition at that passage would by reason and common sense reach the idea of the Saviour's mission into the world, and get comfort from the knowledge of welcome to the benefits thereof; so that an affirmative answer would be joyfully given to the question raised above, if all other parts of the Holy Book were as well translated and as void of mysterious, not to say absurd, notes.

There is evident scholarship exhibited in the wording of the Douay text; but it is a class of learning that could hardly be tributary to the edification of the common reader. Some words chosen to give in English the meaning of the Greek original or of the Vulgate text were seemingly manufactured for the occasion and, as we suppose, could not be found in any English dictionary accessible to the poor. The words "pasch," "Azimes," "Supersubstantial," "Sindon,"

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

“Scenopegia,” “odible,” “correction,” “exinanited,” “agnition,” and many others would seem to need a translator as much as did the original Latin text.

To the credit of Abp. Gibbons it may be said that many of the hard words of the copies of 1609 have been replaced by terms more nearly agreeing with the King James Version, but some (as “pasch”) still remain. It is equally true that a scholar must object to some translations of important texts; as, for example, the passages which give the exhortation of John and the command of Christ as to repentance (Matt. iii. 2; iv. 17) are translated “do penance” instead of “repent;” and the meaning given to the word “penance” being “the infliction of pain or suffering upon the human body,” this expression destroys the spiritual idea intended, and intimates that man can obtain salvation by physical torture in direct opposition to the Saviour’s proposal to give rest (peace) to all who would come to him. When the author of the Greek Gospel wrote “μετανοεῖτε,” he evidently meant an action of mind, not of body, and from the etymology of the word he must have intended to order an entire change of mind as to principles and character. The whole history of the Man of Galilee is opposed to the idea that bodily torture on the part of a sinner can change the sinner’s moral condition; nor can we believe that when Jerome gave the meaning of the above word (in Latin) to be “agite poenitentiam” he intended what is regarded “penance,” but what is understood by “penitence” or “repentance,” an act of the spiritual not the bodily part.

Notwithstanding these defects (and others) in the

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

translation, it as a whole has excellences, and would have received much less condemnation from Protestants had no comments been joined to the text; or had notes *without* partisan zeal and *with* religious fairness, showing that only truth was the object of the writing, characterized the book.

The translations which preceded the Douay Bible, such as Luther's German Bible, Cranmer's, Coverdale's, and Tyndale's English (together with others not so well known) were, so far as we know, far from being faultless; but they did not pretend to give comments on the sacred word and demand for those comments equal authority with the original words of Deity.

The errors of these versions were of minor importance, did not interfere with fundamental truth, and by no means deserve the treatment they received. The call for the version of King James was reasonable, because a nearer approach to the original ideas of the Saviour's language was desirable. It was thought that the Douay Bible, by the character of the notes inseparable, failed to convey the real teaching of the gospel of Christ.

The formulators of the notes (as generally thought) were intensely Roman Catholic. One of them (William Allen) has the credit of inspiring, if he did not actually pen, the address to the people of England in the time of the Spanish Armada, designed to incite rebellion against Queen Elizabeth and cause her murder. One or two passages from the aforesaid notes show how the critics of the Elizabethan age reached their conclusions as to the teaching from Douay.

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

Matthew xxvi. 26, "Take ye and eat. This is my body," has this note: "He does not say, 'This is the figure of my body,' but 'This is my body.' Neither does he say, 'In this or with this is my body,' but absolutely, 'This is my body,' which plainly implies transubstantiation."

The absurd conclusion of such an argument seemed never to have occurred to the writers of it. To admit the logic would make the scene of that upper room a very curious one. The same Jesus who uttered the above words said to the same disciples: "I am the vine, ye are the branches." If Jesus never used metaphor and no metaphor is found in "This is my body," then the conclusion is inevitable that the upper room had only a vineyard scene embracing a large vine having pendent branches. It is as remarkable as sensible in the Douay Bible that no such note is attached to John xv. 1, where Christ says, "I am the vine;" nor do we find any such comment on Revelation i. 20, where it is asserted that "the seven candlesticks *are* the seven Churches."

The truth is that metaphor was common not only in Oriental literature generally but peculiarly frequent in sacred books and in the speeches of the Son of God, including the Sermon on the Mount. The rule seemed to be to employ metaphor whenever the senses of men would make the use thereof plain. In the case before us, the eyes of the disciples were sufficient to make it clear that the body of their Master remained whole during the supper and that the real flesh was not conveyed to the eaters. The reading of a dozen chapters in the Douay Bible, we think, will

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

show about forty metaphors, in the dozen, admitted to be such by the translators.

Proceeding to the celebrated text (Matt. xvi. 18) upon which the supremacy of the Pope is based, we find that the note thereon, written by the scholars of the Roman Catholic Church, insists on the use of metaphor as to the term "rock" to make it out that a man of flesh and blood was *compared* to a rock. This can hardly be doubted as a correct idea, but it is entirely subversive of the note in regard to Christ's body.

Now examining the said note closely, one must be struck with the force of the thought that the term "rock" was used metaphorically, and that it is corroborative of the idea given by the Swiss reformers that the bread of the sacrament had nothing more than a representative character; and the student must, it seems to us, see clearly that there is no supreme power granted to St. Peter by the conversation of salvation's Author. The position in a building could give no authority to a rock in that building further than to fill its place as a coöperator. We could hardly get a better illustration of equality among individuals than that of rocks in a grand structure.

The building must have a beginning. Some one rock must be the first to be used by the builder. This firstness has no further meaning than that of precedence in time or location. The other rocks are equals as to use. Jesus very emphatically names himself as the Builder. Peter was the first to be used on the day of Pentecost. Where can it be discovered that he exercised authority over his compeers?

Both authority and superior wisdom must be ex-

## *The Rheims-Douay Version.*

cluded by a reading of the lamentable story of Peter's denial of his Master and by the fact that, so far as we are informed, he never presided in a Church council; on the contrary, in one assemblage St. Paul "withstood him to his face, because he was to be blamed." The positive prohibition given by our Lord as to the matter of exalting one disciple over the others (see Douay Bible, Mark x. 43) should have been conclusive to the Bishop of Rome when the idea of supremacy first entered his brain. The fact that subsequently ambition prevailed and the Vatican, with all its paraphernalia, was gradually brought into existence will to the end of time be a cause of sorrow to pious hearts. (See Note D, Appendix.)

Evidently the delivery of the keys was a metaphor. All Catholics and Protestants admit this. Firstness to Peter meant that Peter should deliver the first public sermon after the descent of the Holy Ghost, the first to use the keys spoken of; but that others had the privilege of proclaiming the great salvation seems as clear from the inspired volume as language can make it. Acts viii. 4 says: "They that were scattered abroad went everywhere preaching the word." Revelation xxii. 17 says: "Let him that heareth say, Come." When St. Paul had his last interview with the Ephesian elders, he said, "I have not shunned to declare unto you all the counsel of God," and he had just before stated what he considered the acts of the human soul requisite for the conversion of that soul—viz., "Repentance [not doing penance] toward God and faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xx. 21.)



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

From the original New Testament then, and from the history of the Church for several centuries subsequent to the apostolic age, the student must reach the conclusion that the learned men of Douay were erratic in their comments. Nor can any one in the present enlightened age suppose that the present Pope would utter the sentiment that either the translation made at Douay or the notes written thereupon had priority of date over the publications made in the time of Henry VIII. The priest that made this remarkable assertion, intimating that the Douay Bible "had come down to us unchanged from the time of Christ himself," we must suppose had not consulted the Vatican; nor did he get such a notion from any intelligent Catholic authority of veracity. Even Jerome's Vulgate could not claim to be coincident as to time with the original manuscript of the apostles. All translations, of course, claimed the Greek manuscripts as their parents; but the Douay notes could not claim such parentage, and their birth must be dated as the title-page (with Abp. Gibbons's approval) says it was (A.D. 1582-1609). Coverdale's, Tyndale's, and Cranmer's works had preceded the Douay work. Henry VIII. died A.D. 1547, several years before the establishment of the English college at Douay by Cardinal Allen. (See Chambers's "Encyclopedia," Vol. IV., page 68.)

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE AMERICAN REVISED VERSION OF THE ENGLISH BIBLE.

THE most recent translation of Holy Writ is that given to the world by American scholars A.D. 1901. Its immediate parentage, of course, may be found in the English revision of the Scriptures made by the conjoint work of English and American scholars A.D. 1881-1884.

Its more remote ancestry must be looked for in the spirit or motive of obedience that actuated the original disciples who remembered the example of Jesus declaring "the poor have the gospel preached unto them." A noncommunicative scholarship must be an anomaly; a Christian scholar unwilling to tell the real meaning of Christ's words must be a criminal. To dedicate all the knowledge gained from the discovery of the Greek manuscripts nearest the times of the apostles to the elucidation of that meaning to the common people must constitute the duty and the pleasure of the pious discoverer. The crime of mediæval concealment cannot be reproduced until piety shall have been banished from the learning of Christendom. Hence in giving the origin and history of the above-noted version one must refer to the antecedents as well as to the concomitants of the great work.

Very nearly contemporaneous with the Douay edition was the work of the commission given by King

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

James I., of England, to chosen men of much literary attainment "for the determining of things said to be amiss in the Church." The "Authorized Version" of the Bible (of 1611) was the result. The Roman Catholic work at Douay gave its volume in A.D. 1609. The military and civil events in the century preceding had been as remarkable as the revolutions in scientific and religious thought had been startling.

The thinking of Copernicus (1530-1543) as given in his great work (*De Revolutionibus Orbium Celestium*): "concerning the movements of the heavenly bodies" had shown the absurdity of the astronomy theretofore taught; the demonstrations of Galileo, in progress during the work of English and Douay translators, were powerful to show the truth of Copernicus. Feudal castles were tottering to their ruin; and though "the divine right of kings" still lingered in the minds of men, those kings were reminded by many uprisings that the poor had rights which even royalty should and must respect. The Greek classics, long slumbering in forgotten hiding places, were brought out to the inquiring gaze of the investigating learner, and schoolhouses resounded with the music of Greek verse. Architecture and the fine arts felt the resuscitating shock and began a new history of wonderful exercise. It would be next to an absurdity to suppose that the greatest of all subjects, the soul's immortality and accountability, could be absent from the workshop of mind at such a time; for always when the human brain has been most prolific of thought the inquiry as to the *whence* and the *whither* of itself has been most prominent. Hence we are not surprised to learn that

## *American Revised Version of English Bible.*

while Copernicus was toiling in searching for truth in "the starry-decked heavens," Luther's monastic cell was the witness to agonizing thought upon the greater truth, "The just by faith shall live;" and while classic scholars were searching for manuscripts of Homer and Hesiod, Erasmus and Melanchthon were busy in the investigation of the original text giving the words of Jesus on the subject of soul salvation. Nor need one be surprised at the earnest desire of Englishmen to have the Holy Book brought to their vernacular by governmental authority, since previous efforts to give an honest translation (such as Coverdale's) had been the cause of persecution when a monarch of a different creed occupied the throne. Great care was exercised by King James to secure the best scholarship then known for the work of translating; and so far as we can now judge, the more than fifty toilers employed honestly did their work; and for nearly three centuries that work has been before the world as "the Authorized Version appointed to be read in the churches."

The Douay Bible has for the same length of time been Holy Writ to the Roman Catholic world. Neither could claim to *originate*; both should claim to *translate* into English the words of Jesus. Of course relative value must depend upon relative fidelity to the original Scriptures.

The Bible Societies in England and in America have with one accord acted upon the idea that the sacred volume should be given to the people without note or comment; the Roman Catholic idea seems to have been, and to be, that notes dictated by papal

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

writers should always accompany German and English translations. Great zeal has been exhibited by the societies aforesaid to print and to circulate the Holy Bible unaccompanied by notes; the Vatican has, so far as we know, failed to adopt any similar policy. Thus, for many years, the two great parties have stood before civilization with reference to the enterprise of giving to the masses the Great Revelation. It may here be added that literary and scientific progress no less than national prosperity and political influence can be found in those countries in which the Holy Bible has had the greatest circulation in the vernacular tongue.

The excellence of King James's Version can readily be seen from the many volumes of commentaries that have been written upon its teachings and from the length of time that Christendom has called it "the Bible," as well as from universal assent of scholars to the honesty of the translation into the English of 1611.

Two considerations, however, in the latter part of the nineteenth century led religious thinkers in England to suppose that a careful revision would be advantageous. The English language had advanced much in the gliding years, and antiquarian research had been very active.

To the first is due the evident change in the use or meaning of many words; to the latter is due the discovery of older manuscripts and the unearthing of still older rocks or tablets having inscriptions at Nineveh and in Moab and Egypt. (See Note E, Appendix.)

As early as 1859 Archbishop Trench thought on the subject, and made "proposals for revision." Subse-

## *American Revised Version of English Bible.*

quently such learned men as Bishops Ellicott and Lightfoot, Dean Alford, and others gave their serious attention to the subject, the result of which was a formal resolution adopted by the convocation of Canterbury to the effect that "a committee be appointed with power to confer with any committee that may be appointed by the convocation of the Northern Province to report upon the desirableness of a revision of the Authorized Version of the New Testament, whether by marginal notes or otherwise, in all those passages where plain and clear errors, whether in the Greek text originally adopted by the translators or in the translation made from the same, shall on due investigation be found to exist." The Old Testament was afterwards embraced.

The committee thus called for was appointed, and reported March 24, 1870, in favor of a revision. Very appropriately eminent scholars from connections other than the Church of England were invited to coöperate in the great enterprise; and after two years of progress in the actual revision it was determined to ask the scholars of America to join in the work. An American organization was hence formed with Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., as President, and G. E. Day, D.D., as Secretary. The English company was also carefully organized. The whole number of revisers reached about eighty, and they were selected from those most expert in rendering into the English of the present age the Greek and Hebrew text. Reliance also could certainly be placed upon their skill in determining the claims of the various readings as to being the original words of the Holy Book. With critical

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

scholars such as Tregelles, Westcott, Hort, and Scrivener present or accessible the Greek text could be reliably ascertained.

The rules adopted by the revisers were such as would be most productive of accuracy in giving the true sense of God's revelation. Two of them may be copied here—viz.:

“1. To introduce as few alterations as possible consistently with faithfulness.

“2. That the text to be adopted be that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating; and that when the text so adopted differs from that from which the Authorized Version was made, the alteration be indicated in the margin.”

The two companies (English and American) worked harmoniously, having agreed that where there was decided preference for a rendering on the part of the American company it should be placed in an appendix, and the American company promising not to encourage any other publication of the Revised Versions than those issued by the English presses during fourteen years from 1885.

Thus we reach the period of the Version in America dated 1901. The preface of this Version stated that “The judgment of scholars both in Great Britain and in the United States has so far approved the American preferences—*i. e.*, those in the appendix—that it now seems to be expedient to issue an edition of the Revised Version with those preferences embodied in the text.”

The history of the Revised Versions cannot yet be written, because it is not yet made. The abolition of

## *American Revised Version of English Bible.*

King James's Version from the pulpits and homes of the English-speaking people has not been accomplished as yet, nor need such banishment be expected for years to come. The two Versions (that of 1611 and that of 1885) have in some volumes been printed in parallel columns, and thus the one has aided in giving the meaning of the other. It is also true that the number of copies of the Revised Version coming from the English and American presses can be called enormous. The time spent upon this whole work of revision (over twenty years) and the scholarship employed, together with the reputation for honest purpose on the part of the toilers, must give confidence to the public that an English Bible exists giving as nearly as possible the true rendering of the manuscripts that were written in apostolic times.

The discovery of the Codex Sinaiticus by Professor Tischendorf in 1859 gave to the revisers a rich treasure of authority as to the Greek text that was used in the early years of the Church; while all the manuscripts possessed by the King James commission and by the translators at Douay in 1609 were also within reach. As to the greater antiquity of the copy of the Greek text used by the scholars of 1885-1901, there can hardly be any doubt, as Catholic and Protestant alike regard the manuscript from the convent near Mount Sinai as the oldest yet discovered. The pious Christian can take comfort from the fact now known and acknowledged that all the versions give the same great fundamental truths and are plain in the invitation to sinners to come to Jesus with simple penitence and faith in order to be saved.



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

The desire to spread the gospel to all nations must characterize the true Christian. Hence the hope is expressed that translations of Holy Writ into all the languages of the earth will soon be an accomplished fact, and that fidelity to the true words of Jesus equal to that which has given those words to England and America may characterize toilers in all parts of the world. Already translations have been made in 436 languages; but yet about 2,000 dialects remain without a translation of God's Book. (See Appendix, Note F.)

## CHAPTER VII.

### RESPONSIBILITY.

ACCOUNTABILITY is inseparable from the idea entertained of moral agency. A moral agent is one obligated by moral law; and this moral obligation cannot be predicated of the nature merely animal, though the latter is possessed of a kind of spiritual essence called instinct. The exact difference between instinct and mind may not be explainable in words, but that the difference is important and constitutes the foundation of the oughtness known to belong to the possession of reasoning powers cannot fail of recognition.

The root meaning of the term "responsibility" must contain the notion of promising. Derived from a compound Latin word (*respondere*) which means "to promise back again," the word conveys the idea that an actor must reply to an assertion or proposition about the actor by an act or the promise of an act; and because the words "reply" and "respond" have in the progress of language come to mean so nearly the same thing, the dictionaries have given the one as a meaning of the other, and then to add to the latter word's meaning "to give satisfaction," "to make payment."

A "respondent" in courts of justice is "one who answers in certain suits or proceedings, generally those which are not according to the course of the common law as in equity or admiralty causes, in petitions for

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

partitions and the like." The meaning here must be that if the cause is decided in favor of the person making the reply he is absolved from doing what the other asked for, but that if the decision is against him he is to make the satisfaction required.

Now from such facts the thinker readily reaches the proper idea of moral responsibility. The term "moral" refers to duty or obligation, and pertains especially to those acts of mind in which the power of choice is exercised with reference to what is right or wrong. Hence praiseworthiness or its opposite (blameworthiness) must belong to moral acts. The rights of others, not mere selfish and supposed gain, must enter into the reasons for the choice of a habit or course ("moral," from *mos, moris, Latin*) of life; and the same motives must govern in regard to specific actions. "No man liveth to himself." It is equally true, if by the argument from design the proof of Deity is plain and man is forced to look upon his mind as an entity that owes its very existence to God, that there is moral responsibility as to obedience to authoritative laws established by Omnipotence. The respondents in the equity court of Heavenly Jurisprudence must give account of the deeds done in the body. This is a conclusion necessitated by the logic of nature and of revelation, if it be admitted that man rises higher than the merely instinctive in spirit life. That such elevation is fact is also known by the truths discovered by man's intelligence and by what is recorded in the book so abundantly proved to be the history of divine deeds. Neither revelation nor reason can charge an immorality upon the swine that trespassed upon the

## *Responsibility.*

unripe or the matured grain in the fields ; but we give the verdict of dishonesty, without hesitation, to the man who for self-interest turned his hogs into his neighbor's corn.

At once and necessarily the human mind, recognizing its own reasoning powers, feels and knows that there is a rule of right called "honesty ;" and as such a law would be void of force without a penalty for its violation, with equal certainty the reasoner feels the force of the assertion that a moral agent must be governed by moral law, or else either suffer the penalty or have that penalty removed by a pardon from the lawmaker in a scheme devised for the restoration of the offender to favor, without any detracting from the purity or consistency of the executive of law.

Such a scheme, emanating not from mere power but from love and hence from mercy in the possessor of power, published with proved authority and urged upon the acceptance of the volition inherent in the moral agents needing the provisions of favor, must make clear a phase of responsibility as solemn as joyous. The man that needs salvation cannot save himself, but he cannot be saved without himself. Will power in man cannot make the salvation he needs, but there can be no salvation to that man without his will power. A necessitated virtue is no virtue. Man must choose to be honest if he is honest. A supposed case of legal procedure in a civil action may be illustrative here.

Let it be supposed that a man owning real estate becomes deeply involved in debt by borrowing money

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

for purposes of mere appetite; he is unable to pay his debts, and hence suit is brought and an "execution" is secured. The real estate must be sold, and its occupant must be brought to poverty or starvation. At the extremity of need, the lawyer that brought the suit approaches the debtor and says: "I have a friend that proposes to pay off the execution provided you will do two things—viz., renounce the practice of borrowing money to gratify a wrong appetite, and then trust the ability and willingness of the friend to continue to be your friend and protector, of which ability and willingness you have abundant proof."

Now it is readily seen that there is a double responsibility upon this man if that real estate be lost to him. He is as responsible for refusing to give up a wrong practice and failing to trust the proposed benefactor as he was originally responsible for the debts bringing the trouble. It is equally clear that the man of intelligence who has God's Word, but fails to take its precepts for guidance or its promises for comfort, will be held responsible for his own loss of happiness. Nor is it less plain that, as ignorance of law in civil courts is not taken to acquit a citizen who violates a statute that has been duly published, a moral agent cannot plead ignorance of the gospel as a reason for going through life with constant disobedience to its commands and neglect of its promises. Man will be held accountable for the proper use of his knowledge, and not less accountable for learning what he ought to know. The great crime of modern civilization is willful neglect of the means of learning the divine Law Book.

## *Responsibility.*

The astute philosopher who reasons much about affinities and their opposites, of attractions and repulsions, of electricity and magnetism, of suns and planets, of constellations and world systems, and by research tries to discover every *work* of the great Machinist in the busy workshop of infinity, yet pleads ignorance of the *words* of that same great Teacher of mechanics, though those words have been attested by thunderings from the very workshop in which the philosopher professes to study—such a philosopher, we say, must be as deficient in teaching true philosophy as he is dangerous in suggesting a system of ethics. The same great Author who tells of his power and wisdom by his exhibited workmanship tells in his Word of the great plan of mercy for man's redemption. Who can have a right to study the works and omit the word? Well did Bishop Mant write as follows:

What is true knowledge? Is it with keen eye  
Of lucre's sons to thread the mazy way?  
Is it of civic rights and royal sway  
And wealth political the depths to try?  
Is it to delve the earth or soar the sky?  
To marshal Nature's tribes in just array?  
To mix and analyze and mete and weigh  
Her elements and all her powers descry?  
These things who will may know them, if to know  
Breed not vainglory. But o'er all to scan  
God in his works and Word shown forth below;  
Creation's wonders and Redemption's plan;  
Whence came we, what to do and whither go—  
This is true knowledge and "the whole of man."

Manifestly it is plain to a thinker that to study the present surroundings of a human being and omit all

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

thought of that being's prospective needs must be the highest folly. To investigate the "whence" and omit all proffered knowledge of the "whither" in the journey of a spirit traveler through time must be placed on a par with the wisdom of the sea captain who is satisfied to know that his ship started from New York, but he cares not to study chart and compass, and hence knows nothing of the vessel's heading in the open sea. Certainly by as much as the knowledge of what must be done on the bosom of the trackless deep in order to insure a successful voyage exceeds in importance the remembrance of the width of the wharf whence the ship started, by so much is the crime of the captain's ignorance measured. It is not difficult to make application of this representation to the voyager on life's sea.

Responsibility for the outcome of the treatment of the message from heaven's Ruler thus plainly located makes the reflective man ask, Why is it that in the millions of thinkers on earth the amount of study given to the coming condition seems so disproportionate? Why do some professed philosophers reason cogently about the importance of crucibles and microscopes, of telescopes and observatories, of the discoveries of microbes alive and of fossils long dead, but are content to be agnostic as to the word of the Great Being whose mechanism and authority must be so plainly seen in the sciences advocated?

Why is it a fact that so many able statesmen and eloquent political orators apparently confine their reasonings to the importance of patriotism in the voting citizen, but fail, at least by example, to show obedi-

## *Responsibility.*

ence to the laws of that patriotism which reaches to the Ruler of rulers?

Why do so many jurists on the bench and so many practitioners at the bar in courts of justice content themselves with knowing all laws enacted by human legislation, but do not seemingly feel ashamed to absent themselves from the study halls that make a specialty (for a short time in the week) of learning the greatest of all legislation?

Why do so many doctors who know and teach anatomy and physiology stop their study at the border of the material appearance, and fail to make inquiry as to the revelation of responsibility for the soul action of man?

Why do so many business men and day laborers neglect the means of knowing what God has said, while constantly dependent upon what God is every hour performing?

The answer to these questions given in any way possible to the student of responsibility can hardly be complimentary to the average morals of society, nor can it give a very high idea of the wisdom of the actors named. The word most nearly descriptive of the mental action noted may possibly be derived from the word "inconsistency;" but when it is remembered how the average professional or business man resents the charge of inconsistency or dishonor in the work of the office or shop or the store and how disgraceful the proof of such dishonor appears to others and to the man himself, one is led to seek for other descriptives.

In reference to men who make no claim to honor



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

or honesty of purpose in life—men who are willing to father the thought (an expression of which was charged upon a politician in Virginia some years ago) in the slang saying, “Honor will not buy a breakfast”—in regard to these there can be no difficulty in classification. They themselves will make their own grade; they refuse the teachings of Holy Writ because of the high class of morals involved.

A close reasoner can assign no more honorable motive than the above to that class of men denominated sordid or entirely avaricious, whose all of mental activity must be devoted to selfish gain—a specimen of which class was by a poet called “the mean, suspicious wretch whose bolted door ne’er moved in pity to the wandering poor.” Such men may claim honesty, but it is only with the idea of avoiding the penitentiary. The neglect of the gospel must be for a reason similar to the above.

The man who makes ambition or fame an idol to be grasped by any means right or wrong (*fas aut nefas*), at whose door may be placed political corruption and kindred disgraceful wrongs, must be classed by a similar criticism. No man who seeks to get place or power by fraud in deeds or deception in words can claim to be anything but a practical enemy to a book whose all of teaching is for moral right.

To all actors whose motives are plainly and positively dishonest because of selfish cupidity, it may be asserted that “inconsistency” is not a word strong enough to express character. If there is in language a term more base or more expressive of criminality, it may be legitimately used. The moral narcotic that

## *Responsibility.*

has deadened conscience may very readily enter into the diagnosis of such cases, and the prescription that should follow must be similar to the prophecies uttered to fallen Jerusalem. Unless there be obedience to the command, "Awake thou that sleepest," and then a casting away of the narcotic poison, there must be a ruin that defies verbal description.

But there are men whose morality rises higher than that indicated in the preceding paragraph, yet they do not connect themselves with the visible Church and thereby acknowledge an intention to take the words of Christ as their guide in meeting the obligations of a moral agent. There must be a reason for such a position on the part of a thinker. The judge whose decisions on the bench show a conscientious regard for moral law, and whose private life is unimpeachable so far as it is or can be known to his associates, frequently neglects public worship and leaves the matter of private devotion hypothetical. So far as example goes, there is no argument for obedience to the command, "Preach the gospel to every creature," by giving aid and sympathy to those whose duty it is to stand at the sacred desk. History makes it clear that some occupants of "the White House" in the Federal capital, and of the gubernatorial mansions in many States, though recognizing the validity of revelation by placing the hand upon the great Book at the taking of the inaugural oath, have yet failed to give the religious world an undoubted evidence of a heart acceptance of Christ. Unwilling to have patriotism or political creed doubted, they seemingly were willing to allow their fellow-citizens to be ignorant of how far

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

they accepted the plan of mercy recorded by the pen of inspiration. To the same class of moralists must belong all the citizens who claim to be honest gentlemen and whose word can hardly be doubted, but who do not make public the character of their allegiance to Him who spake as never man spake.

What reason can be given for such a position? Certainly not that given relative to what are known as outbreaking violators of law. The high standard of morals erected by revelation can hardly be an objection on the part of these gentlemen; for they claim to have the same. They would resent the charge of doing a mean, low trick for base gain. Admitting this, can one say there is no responsibility in the matter of public acceptance of truth? Certainly not; for every thinking and honest jurist would earnestly contend for a different idea in the courts of justice. No juror or witness will be allowed to fail in making public either testimony or verdict.

The description given by Shakespeare is accepted by gentlemen as the standard of the honorable man—viz.:

His nature is too noble for the world;  
He would not flatter Neptune for his trident,  
Or Jove for his power to thunder. His heart's his mouth:  
What his breast forges, that his tongue must vent.

Hence no man will sincerely excuse a juror for either failing to study evidence or to declare conviction of truth after studying evidence. By this known illustration of responsibility, this humble scribe long ago reached the thought of duty as well as privilege in enlisting in Immanuel's army publicly *and* privately.

## *Responsibility.*

How much the relief to the thinkers of Christendom would have been had all funeral orations of great men truthfully stated, in each case, a public announcement on the part of the deceased of connection with some regiment of the great army of religious soldiers! The same kind of reflection must be had in reference to scientists and gentlemen!

From such a train of thought it must appear that due reflection was not given, by the honorable men to whom allusion has been made, to the all-roundness of character needed in the make-up of a man fully allied to the law of right. Arrest of thought on this subject is much needed in civilization. If the judge who on the bench says to all the parties in a court trial, "Render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's," would, after retiring from the consideration of the civil statutes, remember the completion of the sentence, "And unto God the things that are God's," would he not be found bearing testimony at the next sacramental service in his reach of obedience to the command, "This do in remembrance of me?"

But why has thought slumbered in the one case and been quite alive as to the other? What is the peculiar narcotic that acts with such partiality? How has conscience been quieted as to a part of man's responsibility and not as to the whole? More urgently may the question be pressed: Why is the nonthought in reference to the most important phase of responsibility? Can care as to strict justice to bodily wants atone for carelessness in provision for soul wants?

No one will dare to give an affirmative answer to this latter question. Consequently in thinking of the

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

cases before mentioned and of all similar ones the student must suppose a lack of faith in the fact of revelation's offer or a misapprehension of the part to be performed by the moral agent seeking its benefits. In the one case there is great error in creed; in the other, great injustice to the moral actor himself. The skepticism in the one case may be speedily removed by a revision of the suggestions of Nature's book—the design and the Designer along with the positive proof that the Designer has given his plan in plain words so far as man is concerned. Agnosticism as to Christ's resurrection seems an impossibility when the historical proofs are carefully studied. Even Mr. Huxley, the originator of the term (it seems), before his last breath requested that his burial be with the formula which acknowledged the creed: "I believe in the resurrection of the body."

The reasoning hinted in the former pages of this little volume can hardly be thought void of truth. Who can doubt the power of the Giver of life to *regive* life? And if he says he did it, he did it. And then if that great Being records an act of his own to the following effect—viz., "God so loved the world that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life"—who can fail to see the design of the resurrection of the Son of God and the consequent rich heritage of all who choose to do as he directs?

The second horn of the dilemma named may be robbed of its power by a removal of its cause—that is, by changing "misapprehension" to "apprehension."

Fully comprehend the meaning of the terms upon

## *Responsibility.*

which the inheritance is offered, then the location of responsibility for its possession must be easy. If those terms require an act of choice (or will) on the part of the moral actor and that choice be sincerely made, then the possession is as certain as that there is truth in the Being making the offer. That the common-sense meaning of gospel offerings does require will or choice seems quite plain. When the Saviour said, "Repent, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand," he evidently made appeal to the power of choice to quit a wrong practice and begin a right one. Suppose the wrong to be that of a Jew who had been neglectful of justice in trade or of regularity and sincerity in supporting the temple service, that Jew's will power must order an entire change in practice as to these duties. His repentance is tested by the fidelity of this act of determination. Nothing is commanded beyond the power of choice. In the times of modern thought the same principle holds. If the fault of a President, a Governor, or a Judge be the simple omission of a known duty of giving attendance upon the means of letting his position be known, his will power is competent to order a reform. Responsibility is readily seen.

Now as to the requirement of faith the fatal misapprehension perhaps more frequently occurs. Men of great mental capacity have sometimes acted as though choice had nothing to do in the matter named in the words "whosoever believeth." They seem to quiet conscience by the supposition that a sort of fatality or compulsory action (*ab extra*) outside of their own minds must produce the obedience in the

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

individual powers. Such a persuasion may be the parent of delay in some very capable men. In such minds all other moral requirements are taken to mean propositions made to volitional actors. No sensible judge or jury would hang a prisoner for what that prisoner had really no blame as to the causing. Had it been clearly shown that Guiteau had no intention to kill President Garfield and that the pistol was really fired by another person who adroitly took the weapon from the owner's pocket, then aimed and pulled the trigger, but made his escape in the subsequent confusion, the conviction would not have been as it was.

All this is readily seen, but the same person will often speak as if volition were not to be found in the act called credence. A careful study of mental action cannot fail to show at what point responsibility for faith begins, and hence where the mistake as to volitional action may be noted. Positive knowledge or positive ignorance may often be of a compulsory character. This writer is unable to be ignorant of the fact that a shining sun enables him to see what he would be unable to see in total darkness; but if asked to state positively what is on the surface of that sun, he must plead a necessitated ignorance. It is as certainly a fact that by closing the eyes a man may refuse to see the things around him, but the ignorance of them is not necessitated. He himself is responsible for it. Ignorance because of an impossibility of learning may be void of responsibility; but ignorance because of a positive and voluntary refusal to put forth an exertion of mental faculties cannot be placed

## *Responsibility.*

in the same category. A gun is fired by a fifteen-year-old boy; a playmate falls mortally wounded. The one that pulled the trigger pleads ignorance of the fact that the gun was loaded. Is he clear of all fault? No, he had no right to pull that trigger in ignorance. Man is responsible for knowing certain truths, especially those intimately connected with his future good. It is not justice to one's self to remain ignorant of "the whither" of a road he takes, when he can know by a little study of a possessed waybill and the visible signboard.

Now faith is not knowledge, but it is not without knowledge. The requisite knowledge is attainable by human powers. It consists of such intuitive and acquired truths as will show conclusively that the Creator makes himself known in his work and in his word, and that command as to human action is positive and plain. Man is not responsible for making the facts which come to his knowledge, but he is responsible for acceptance and reliance such as will cause conduct and hence a peaceful state of mind. A resolution—a firm purpose of future position—accompanies a reliance which evidently has in it an act of will. The trusting involved in casting one's care upon a remedy must be a voluntary deed. It must be so because refusal is possible.

Faith as a requirement, then, is reasonable, because moral character is involved. A remedial scheme by which virtue or moral justification can be regained after the loss of innocence must have its offers made to the power of choosing; for otherwise virtue or morality is excluded from the recipient of benefit. There



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

can be no praise or blame attached to a man carried from position to position without his own volition or without his knowledge, the carrying being done by a power entirely outside of the man himself. Motion on the part of a human body can have a moral phase only when the will determined that motion, and then the action is good or bad in proportion to the morality of the intent. A reasonable man cannot say that the moral nature of an act is discovered always by its immediate or remote effects. Suppose a highway robber secretes himself on the roadside with a loaded shotgun knowing that a horseman with a sum of money would soon pass on his way to a bank of deposit. The horseman approaches; the robber fires. The bag of money causes the shot to fail of its deadly aim, but the horseman is seriously wounded by the glancing missiles. The robber is arrested, the deed is proved. Every surgical attention possible is given to the wounded man, and after much suffering he recovers. Can the robber be guiltless of either robbery or murder by the failure of his purposes? Can any moralist suppose that the skill and success of surgery can change the moral character of the man that aimed and fired?

By this and similar questions a thinker must be able to see the possibility of a very heinous offense against moral law, although no very serious results followed the deed. The turpitude of the design to blow up the Parliament House in England was not mitigated by the discovery and removal of the powder. It is therefore plainly seen by all moral intelligence that judicial purity or fairness must consider motive and the pow-

## Responsibility.

er of the will, when that purity determines a verdict of morality.

This great principle must hold good in a plan designed for the recuperation of virtuous character. The Saviour of the world no more than the Creator of the world can be supposed to favor the abolition of law. The great rule of right must be the fundamental thought in every scheme of Providence. Obedience to this law must enter into the redemptive sacrifice of Calvary's Victim. By that sacrifice God can be just and yet pardon the sinner of his past sins. It is enough for us that the Omnipotent One proclaims this truth by the incontestable miracle of Christ's resurrection and ascension. The price is sufficient, or else the Ruler of the Universe would not have approved. Man to be happy must take God at his word.

But it must be quite as evident that, as the whole history of Jesus of Nazareth shows his intent to be a moral elevation and not a moral degradation—an upward and not a downward enterprise, one to make man better and not worse in a moral sense—the salvation was to be *from* sin, not *in* sin. Past sins can be forgiven for Christ's sake; but there can be no remission of the past wrongs when future wrongs enter into the resolutions of the man. There must be a firm purpose of consenting to God's plan and of obedience to gospel law.

Voluntary resolution, then, is found in both repentance and faith. Responsibility is hence an undeniable fact.

This truth may be impressed upon the mind by an illustration taken from the plowman's toil in winter.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

The farmer to whose planting allusion was made in a former chapter had "broken up" the ground long before he put in his seed corn. Perhaps this work was performed when frost was in the soil. Suppose a visitor approaching had asked the plowman why he toiled at a time when it was certain that corn could not germinate. His reply perhaps might be something of an acknowledgment of an error of past farming in delaying preparation up to the period of time when actual planting would demand all of his time. He has resolved not to repeat an error. But if pressed for a reason as to refusing to deposit seed during the cold season, he would give his knowledge of approaching warm weather. If inquiry be made as to the certainty of that information, he will say: "I am certain of it because I rely upon this known fact in nature's movements."

It is by no means difficult to see at what point the volition or choice of the farmer acts both in the matter of avoiding the repetition of an error and in the placing of confidence in a work of nature yet to be performed, nor is any one at a loss to see responsibility on the part of the same farmer as to the act of choice in reliance and consequent action. Religious responsibility rests upon the power of choice in man to obey or disobey the law of abandoning known wrong and exercising implicit trust in the Saviour's deed and word.

It has been stated somewhere of Gen. Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson that in early life he was somewhat doubtful on the subject of religion. Serving in Mexico under General Scott, and having, no doubt, an opportunity in the Mexican capital after its capture

## *Responsibility.*

to observe a very unfavorable phase of priestly domination in the merely formal worship, he did not allow this corruption of Church creed to confirm skepticism in his mind, but he began to reason as to the doctrine upon which the formalism had been ingrafted and came to the solemn conviction that his duty as a thinker was to search for truth—to reason from what he knew to what he desired to know in answer to the questions: “Did Christ rise from the tomb? and am I hence responsible for trusting in his word?”

Reaching truth here from proofs no doubt such as have been shown to belong to the mode by which the historical affirmation has come down to us, this reasoner obeyed the injunction of faith and at once joined an evangelical Church.

It is quite evident in this case, as in all similar cases, that there was a moment when choice was made by a firm purpose of the will not to float along through life in the darkness of doubt, but to take hold of revealed truth and put confidence in duty made known by the works and words of power. Men do choose to trust a captain’s honesty and skill whenever they start to cross the ocean on a steamship, although the fallibility of all human beings must be acknowledged; why not trust the great Jehovah, who cannot be either fallible or false?

Surely an urgent appeal can be made on this subject to all thinking men to meet the responsibility here so plainly seen. There appears no possible way of avoiding the responsibility for giving credence to truths that storm the intellect when properly studied; nor can there be even imagined a reasonable ground

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

for failing to study them. Men may legitimately refuse to consider themes or problems which cannot have any bearing upon their future weal or woe; but to allow carelessness or indifference with reference to that employment of mind power which is inevitably connected with the highest destiny of the thinker can by no means be void of inexcusable wrong against the Giver of mind, and more especially against the mind itself.

The weight of this responsibility may be further considered by taking the thought of the known influence of supposedly cultivated men upon those of less culture. This influence can hardly be subjected to the science of measurement. Its greatness constitutes a valid reason for despair in calculation; yet no intelligent man can fail to recognize its power. Every advance in civilization is in evidence to show that leaders of thought have inaugurated great reforms and the masses have followed. In this connection it is proper to ask if there is any astute philosopher who can tell how far the masses of any nation would have been advanced in moral and in religious happiness had it been a fact that all educated men were outspoken advocates of taking a decided stand for practical religion, that religion which logically follows the proof of design in creation and the proof of historical veracity in the gospel.

There is still another phase of responsibility resting upon the citizen of a civilized country having access to the volume of divine revelation. If it be undoubtedly shown that the persons who reject the plan of salvation because of the high grade of morals

## *Responsibility.*

demanding in repentance and faith are dishonorable and suicidal; if those who claim that they are opposed to every phase of dishonesty in business, commercial or professional, but fail to take hold of the precepts of Holy Writ for guidance and of the promises for comfort—if such persons are doing a wrong to themselves and to their fellow-citizens by an attempted silence on religious experience, what duty is certainly imposed upon the adherents to gospel truth? Can true Christians be unconcerned about the acceptance or nonacceptance of the most important message that ever came from heaven to men?

To give an affirmative here would be as absurd as to say that hatred and love are the same in essence. Until a true patriot can consistently use all his powers to injure or ruin his country, no lover of his God and of his race can be void of care as to the moral condition of his fellow-citizens. Hence there must be responsibility upon the professors of Christianity to use every exertion possible for the circulation, study, and acceptance of the Holy Book whose pages tell so plainly the sure way to peace and happiness. The command, "Thou shalt not steal," or the injunction, "Thou shalt not kill," can claim no more of the grammatical imperative than do the words, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." To preach the gospel without an attempt to make known the words of inspiration given by the gospel's Author would be as senseless as it would be in a lawyer to attempt to have a will probated in court without producing the will itself. To the sincere preacher the Holy Bible is as much an indispensable

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

requisite as the copies of statutory or constitutional law must be to jurists and lawyers. It is equally true that, as laws must be made public, the Scriptures should be given to all classes of people, and these classes should be taught to read them.

A fearful responsibility must hence rest upon any ecclesiastic who by supposed Church authority keeps the Book of revelation hidden from the search of the multitude and tries to substitute therefor the words of a fallible occupant of the pulpit. Equal guilt must belong to the attempt to quiet conscience by the vain assertion that the pure word of God is given to the people when that word is accompanied by human mandates directly contrary to the original text, but claiming equal authority with the text and forbidding the reading of the original.

By these plain, common-sense statements the truth seeker is forced to the assertion that ecclesiastic organizations are charged with the duty of making every possible exertion to guard the sacred Book from any and every misleading addition not found in the words of inspiration. The same investigator has the compulsion to see the truth of a responsibility for the selection of a translation or version that gives proof of adhering most closely to the meaning of the language in the first writing. It is hardly needed here to say that this humble scribe, so far as he is able to judge, must aver that the American Version, produced by the care of the best Christian linguists of the world, is more reliable than the Douay Version, as the latter has annotations plainly contradictory of the original wording.

## CHAPTER VIII.

### RECAPITULATION.

IN the first chapter of this little book it is stated as undeniable that man has certain powers of mind by which he becomes as sure of knowledge acquired as of knowledge intuitive. Sense perception is reliable when thoroughly corroborated by undeniable concurrent testimony. By this mode of acquiring knowledge, man knows that there are certain regular motions in the universe of matter that are beyond the control of his own mind. He as certainly knows that there are other motions whose cause must be found in his own volition. By a logic whose conclusions are as sure as intuition he feels that a lump of granite has no determining power of self-movement. When moved by his own hands, the matter does not cause the movement, nor do the hands; but a will power of mind that makes the decree.

The thought is hence inevitable that the motions that are beyond human agency evidence a power originating the sublime movements in heaven and in earth. This great power cannot be classed as material, for matter, if moved, must have a mover. The original mover is therefore spiritual. Design appearing in all the regular changes of place discovered in vegetable or animal bodies, and this design so plainly answering to the design seen in the motions of the planets and suns of the universe, must force the thinker to a knowledge of what he may legitimately



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

term omniscience in the greatest of thinkers, as the origin of the movements of worlds and the constancy of the same must necessitate knowledge of Omnipotence and Omnipresence.

Specimens of designs are given, two of which may be emphasized here, one from the minute and one from the great or sublime. The first is found in the plumule and the caulicle of sprouting seeds whose determination, the one to go upward and the other downward, must positively prove a designer; the second is discovered in the fact of fixity in the angle of inclination of the earth's axis to the plane of its orbit designed to contribute to the same result as that designed in the workshop of vegetation. These two examples, multiplied by millions of similar proofs, cannot fail to show power allied to wisdom in the great factor.

But if there should be in any mind (as there seemed to be in the German thinker, Kant) any lack of certainty in the argument from design, that difficulty must be removed, if it be proved that the Designer has proclaimed himself by words as well as works.

In the second chapter the words of the Revealer are shown to be the only guide for men in the search of a plan of moral recuperation. The third chapter gives a common-sense view of Jehovah's chosen mode of revelation. The fourth chapter gives the credibility of the history given in Holy Writ. In the fifth chapter there is a candid and, we think, a fair examination of the Douay Version of the Scriptures showing that there is much value in the text but decided and great error in the notes which claimed the au-

## *Recapitulation.*

thority of the Roman Pontiff as the vicar of Jesus Christ on earth, and hence to be received as equal to the text in doctrine.

The sixth chapter gives the history and character of the American Revised Version; and from the evidence thereby gained it seems clearly shown that the original deliverances are faithfully transferred to the present condition of the English language, and hence, without note or comment, may be relied upon as the Holy Bible in modern language.

The seventh chapter shows the responsibility undoubtedly resting upon the intelligent minds of the present age to take God at his word for personal salvation and then to aid in every possible way in the spread of gospel truth.

The eighth chapter makes a brief recapitulation, and to this the writer asks permission to add a

### CONCLUSION FOLLOWED BY A SERMON ON FAITH.

The conclusion to which the student of nature and revelation must come, from the known facts of science and proved history, seems as certainly true as that the facts are beyond contradiction.

The argument from design shows a contriving power behind the movements of vegetable and animal life, as surely as the workings of thought show thought power in man himself. Dr. J. W. Lee was so confident of this that he asserted: "It is as evident that God exists as it is that nature or man exists. Nature is the object of sense sight, man is the object of self sight, and God is the object of religious sight."

The words of the great Contriver, proved to be his

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

by miraculous attestation, give to man knowledge of moral law as certainly as the regularity of physical movements can be regarded as demonstrative of natural law. The only question to be settled by man's reasoning is that of an authentic narrative as to the giving process. This authenticity as to what is called God's true revelation seems assured by miracle—the only trustworthy witness in such a court of inquiry. A miracle is an event possible only by an intervention of divine power; it is used as attesting the authority of a religious teacher and as authenticating words spoken by Jehovah or by his authorized messengers. When so used, it precludes all possible denial of the truth delivered.

Such an authority must belong to the miracles of Christ, especially to the crowning miracle of the resurrection. That this actually occurred as the Holy Scriptures narrate has been abundantly shown by evidence of far more proving power than that usually taken by jurists to establish a matter of fact. No other power than that belonging to the original Giver of life can even be imagined to produce the work of that Sunday morning when the sepulcher was made vacant and the resurrected Jesus spoke to wondering witnesses.

The celebrated logician, Aristotle, could give no surer assertion as to an event than that an event was from one of three causes—viz., from necessity (*i. e.*, from a determining will power), from the development of nature's working (*i. e.*, what modern philosophers call evolution), or from chance (*i. e.*, from no cause or force at all). The last two suppositions are evi-

## *Recapitulation.*

dently excluded from this great event by the laws of common sense, and hence the resurrection was caused by a great will power; and its design was as that will power declared in positive language. The exclusion above named is certain, because force was exhibited in coming out from the tomb (excluding chance), and the same was contrary to the known natural fate of a dead body (thus excluding evolution).

The resurrection of Christ proved to be historical by the most trustworthy of monumental evidences—viz., the ordinances of memorial observances constantly before the eyes of intelligent men, things which defy the ingenuity of man to account for except upon the supposition of veracity in the sacred record—must thoroughly establish the truth of the revelation which that Christ approved. Hence our conclusion imposes the duty of an endeavor to enforce all the items of responsibility named in a former chapter upon the attention of thinking men; and also to urge the thought upon those men that items of responsibility omitted by this writer, but occurring to their more accurate thinking, must have equal attention. The greatest thought power of man should be exercised as to the greatest interest of man as an immortal and accountable being.

Only in obedience to the injunction, "Seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness," can the true philosophy of probationary life be followed. To destroy the well-authenticated deed (or will) giving an estate on the other side of the ocean to a voyager, and to do this simply to start the burning of fuel for comfort during the passage, could hardly vindicate

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

sanity in the passenger. Shall the voyager over life's sea be equally void of wise forethought?

But our conclusion must embrace yet another solemn thought. It is that of great sorrow that the intellect that has produced much of the literature of the world demonstrating to a marvelous extent both the minute and the sublime of nature's activity and at the same time showing the greatness of a genius capable of exploring such wide fields of scientific thought—that such intellect has not always reached obedience to the great Lawgiver whose works have been explored. Men have not always obeyed the exhortation: "Read in nature nature's God." The sorrow here indicated is by no means lessened when it is discovered that the men so proficient in the science of nature fail to say anything about nature's birth or parentage, yet gain an influence over the learned world far enough to be regarded as authority as to scientific discovery; and by silence at the point at which there ought to be the greatest interest for human good these philosophers lay the foundation for a skepticism as dangerous to the soul as destructive to intellectual consistency. What advantage can there be in the light of a lamp whose flame will cease at the point where the darkness is greatest? Why refuse a more valuable illuminator whose brightness increases as needs increase?

Dropping metaphor, we ask: Why should a scientist refuse to accept information as to that which his science is unable to explain? Why be content with ignorance when knowledge is urgently proffered by a competent teacher?

The toiler in each department of natural science

## *Recapitulation.*

learns great and important truths from experiment and observation. He has no doubt of facts when seen, and he is confident of truths that logically follow from experiment; but in every case he reaches a point beyond which he cannot go in actual work of hands or eyes. At this point he has indubitable proof of a working power beyond his own; why should this investigator refuse to have faith in the positive word of that power when at every step of previous progress he has exercised faith in the works of that same power? For example, the student of agriculture says he knows that perfect seed corn will, when properly planted, send out from itself plumule and caulicle. How does he know it? Evidently his knowledge is no more than the act of faith in the promise implied in the work (as to former seeds) performed by an unseen power starting into activity the germ life. The truth is all that progress in toil, scientific or other, is of necessity based upon such promise as to like causes producing like effects. Then we would press the question: Why should any reasoner take an implied promise and refuse to take from the same power a positive one expressed in words?

Can there be greater evidence of promised exertion of power in an implication drawn from a known past deed without an actual word than from a known past deed accompanied by language explanatory of the deed? The application of this question to the works of Deity in nature and in revelation must be plain. Jehovah gives in nature implied promises by the regular movements of matter. In revelation he gives **positive promises in words accompanying those words**

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

by deeds to render the authority thereof undeniable; why should a man calling himself "scientific" accept the less and refuse the greater proof of the divine will? Can that be called "science" which omits all the important parts of an investigation? Would it be thought "scientific" in a chemist to accept proof of hydrogen in the make-up of water, but to aver that he had no proof of oxygen? Can the science of a tree be void of all knowledge of the fruitage? Can a scientist say that he has knowledge of the matter in his own make-up, but that he cannot know anything about the mind that enables him to speak?

What is science after all? Derived from the Latin word *scio*, "I know," the term must mean "knowledge." When applied to nature and hence called "natural science," it must mean a knowledge of the material universe so far as human investigation can go. Human investigation actually goes far enough to demonstrate the existence of an invisible power behind visible effects. Can that be called complete science which fails to give any account of this greatest of all demonstrations made by the toiler in matter? Can that toiler be candid and omit the telling of his most important discovery?

From these and similar questions the kinship of science and religion must be apparent. To attempt to be distrustful as to God's verified word, while trusting in implied promises as to the return of the seasons, the sprouting of seeds, etc., seems a folly as displeasing to the Creator as unjust to one's own mental being; for the very experiments as to nature's workings, placed alongside of the proved account of

## *Recapitulation.*

Christ's resurrection, can tell nothing less than the truth of identity of being in the Producer of the seasons and the Producer of miracle at the tomb of Jesus. Every sweep of the philosopher's telescope and every use of the chemist's crucible can tell only of faith in an implied promise made by discovered facts, and these facts prove the power that made them. The same power made the fact of resurrection of the Saviour, who promises eternal and happy life to those that accept his word.

If this line of thought be prosecuted by the thoughtful reader, he will certainly see the impossibility of supposing true science and true religion to antagonize. Such a supposition would be as rational as it would be to say the thought of Brooklyn Bridge antagonized the thought of the foundation and the pillars upon which the bridge rests. There could be no bridge without a foundation; could there be science without the thought of the builder of the things that science declares? Science is an effect, and not a cause; but it is not an effect without a cause. Hence no true scientist can consent to ignore the discovery of facts that inevitably point out the cause of causes.

Modern philosophers have done a great work for the world's progress in the conveniences of living. There should be no discouragement given by Christians to the most thorough search of every department of the field of learning. To learn a scientific fact is to widen the view which man may take of greatness allied to mercy. The great Architect will not allow one of his works to contradict another, nor can it be expected that his work in the material will contradict



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

his word in the spiritual activities. Hence it is no wonder that the majority of profound thinkers, such as Kepler, Newton, the Herschels, Mr. Gladstone, and others, have been the more religious the more they have explored the highways of intellectual acquisition. They have revered God's word in proportion to their discoveries in the laws of his mechanism.

But, unfortunately for the good of humanity, there have arisen in the last century philosophers who seemingly try to rob investigation of its most important certainty, and hence they say there is no knowledge where it is of the highest need to the human soul to have knowledge. These teachers claim knowledge of effects, but deny knowledge of the cause of those effects, though the latter is as plainly written as the former, and more authoritative. Whether these great minds intend it or not, their deliverances have, no doubt, kept many honest persons away from that spiritual peace which the whole truth is able to impart; and the same class of teaching has given to other persons vain excuses for soul neglect, because they suppose they can quote scientific authority in denominating the claims of religion as "unscientific." Pride of science, falsely so called, may keep men away from the real science that "maketh wise unto salvation."

The duty of the Church here seems plain. It is not to decry science, but to *have* science, and thus be able to meet philosophy on its own ground. Equally lucid is the statement that not only the possession of science but the use of that knowledge in a thorough refutation of scientific error should belong to the soldiers of the cross. All Christians cannot be scientists

## *Recapitulation.*

in the ordinary meaning of that term, as all soldiers cannot be scouts; but all Christians can encourage education, as all armies can train a class of scouts.

It is a remarkable circumstance in the history of the Church that gnosticism and agnosticism, the one in the second century and the other in the nineteenth century, reached exactly the same erratic thought as to the Ruler of the universe. Though the names suggest opposition, yet the account given shows that both systems indicate the impossibility of knowing God, even when that Great One declares himself! That is, that no one knows the word of God to be true, although there have been and are men who have declared their knowledge of God's attributes.

The theory of knowledge upon which these systems proceed is evidently as contrary to common sense as destructive to sound logic. Give such a theory to our race and compel concordant action, or rather nonaction, the result would inevitably be the stoppage of all the enterprises of scholastic toil, including those of which the advocates of these systems boast so much. Stagnation, not progress, would be the fate of the entire earth's population. The reply to the question, "When does a man know a fact?" is of great importance in the resolves for action; but according to agnostic teaching the answer must be, "Man really knows nothing." It is, however, a comforting thought that the average agnostic professes to know many things, and would perhaps feel insulted if the appellation he has chosen were translated into another language and the legitimate result (that of calling an agnostic an *ignoramus*) should follow.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

It is, however, no proof of consistency in these gentlemen that they seem to desire their system to be applied to that only which relates to the most vital truth, the knowledge of God.

Man certainly knows some things, and he knows that he knows them, even when the "how" of knowing may be beyond speculation. All the metaphysics of the earth could never convince the man planting corn that he did not know what he was doing; nor could any scientist ever prove to the observer of the action that there was no truth in his observation. The two kinds of knowledge, intuitive and acquired, are uncontradictable as to their testimony. The agnostic philosopher acts upon this declaration until he comes to speak of the cause of causes.

Very true, there is in human experience a phase of mind sometimes called knowledge which, after all, is only faith, as we have shown in the matter of seed corn; but that evidently is based upon certain knowledge of previous actions.

Tennyson wrote:

We have but faith; we cannot know;  
For knowledge is of things we see;  
And yet we trust it comes from Thee,  
A beam in darkness: let it grow.

But he did not intend to deny knowledge. The faith in such cases is the same action of the mental make-up as is required in the words: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ."

The error of Mr. Huxley and his followers seems clearly an injustice to the nature of mind. Man has no right to deny that he knows what he does know.

## Recapitulation.

The criticism of Mr. Huxley (as reported in the *Methodist Review* of New York) on the celebrated *Cogito ergo sum* ("I think, therefore I am") coming from the French thinker, Descartes, seems plainly to indicate philosophic error because a denial of fact. The critic calls this saying "a ridiculous piece of bad logic." He says: "All I can say at any time is *cogito*." Was this all he could say? Was he not, if a logical reasoner, compelled to admit being when thinking was admitted? Could there be thinking without the existence of the thinker? Evidently the French philosopher supposed the major premise of the syllogism would be supplied by every sensible reader, and the whole would be:

All persons that think are (*i. e.*, exist).

I think,

Therefore I am (*i. e.*, "I exist").

The misinterpretation of the word "therefore" by Mr. Huxley is as wonderful as it is inexcusable in a great intellect. Is there a system of logic anywhere to be found that makes the minor premise to be more than a statement of a fact as to one of the things already described in the major?

Could any one suppose that Descartes designed to "put the cart before the horse" and assert existence to be caused by the act done after existence had begun? Descartes, however, was evidently right in making the fact of thinking an indubitable proof of existence on the part of the thinker.

Reaching the truth that thought proves the existence of an acting thinker, the searcher for truth must clearly see the absolute falsity of the agnostic theory

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

that the human mind is ignorant of all the Deity so plainly proved in nature's work and especially proved by verbal deliverance. Of course no finite mind can know all of the infinite. The less cannot contain the greater; but what the Infinite condescends to reveal to the finite must be a possible part of the knowledge of the finite, and should dictate reverence and worship.

When a rational mind discovered the great law of attraction in all known worlds, and was perhaps complimented for the value of his mental work, he said that he seemed to himself as one walking on the seashore picking up here and there a valuable pebble, while the ocean of truth lay unexplored. He did not call himself an agnostic as to discoverable characteristics of the ocean whose depths he could never see. The man on the shore had no compulsory ignorance of the waves or the brine of the deep, nor could he be unaware of the sublimity and the presence of the great waters; and this fact will illustrate the command to "know the true God and Jesus Christ whom God has sent."

Having thus seen the inexcusable folly of neglect on the part of learned men, of the greatest interests, of the soul on the ground of supposed agnostic doctrine, the student of religious truth must be convinced that duty requires the heralds of the cross to make every possible exertion for an arrest of thought, that will place the attention of every thinker upon the matter of personal acceptance of the plan of salvation so plainly taught in the proved version of the Scriptures. All that is needed in the cultivated mind is such an arrest of reason as will take religious truth upon the same

## *Recapitulation.*

basis of proof as that to which credence is given in all the facts of science and history. Every hall of science and every teacher therein should be convincing testimony of the authority of gospel offers; and hence it should be fact that happiness in trusting the God of nature belong to every student of nature.

But if a reason for the neglect be called for, and the reply be given that men are disgusted with the inconsistencies of sectarian teaching and practice—that the revolting deeds of popes and priests in former times, no less than the silly vagaries of many who call themselves “Christian” in the present age, must be sufficient to drive thinkers to a policy of neglect—then let the questions be propounded: Would this course be pursued by the same thinkers in regard to interests of far less value? Does an heir give up his claim under his father’s will because his fellow-heirs intend to use their portion in a way that will deprive property of all value? Will a physician abandon his profession because there are quacks? Will an honest lawyer give up his practice because there are shysters?

A negative to each of these questions from the better part of the human family is a necessity, because truth, not trickery, is the object of search. With infinitely greater reason must the negation be given to the question: Is it wise to neglect the plan of true salvation because professors of it have sometimes been false? This remark must be true until it can be demonstrated that wisdom requires a passenger, whose all of fortune and happiness must be obtained by going across the ocean on a safe liner, to refuse to cross on the gang plank to the ship because he had heard that

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

a man in whose integrity he had no confidence *professed* a purpose of taking the same line of travel, but had never set foot on shipboard. Will it never be impressed upon men that only true soldiers are enrolled in Immanuel's war office? Really bad people do not belong to the true list of passengers on "the old Ship of Zion."

The following words from a secular paper will illustrate the error we criticise, when that error is applied to patriotism:

"At this season we hear men say: 'I am disgusted with politics, and I wash my hands of the whole wretched business. I shall take no part in the primary election.'

"Now in simple reason is that patriotic? Is it sensible? Is that the way to root out the political weeds and make a Democratic harvest? Is that the way to make popular government a success? If all pure men take that stand, the government must go to destruction. The hope of popular government is in the pure men of the land; and if they surrender and give up the struggle, the doom of popular government will have been sealed."

How much stronger does the appeal become when made in reference to interests that end not with "the wreck of matter and the crash of worlds?"

Finding not even the shadow of a good reason for neglecting a great truth and a very vital good in the falsehoods of profession, let the student ask if hope for the soul can be found in any other system than that plainly taught in the Bible as that great Book is given now in English.

## *Recapitulation.*

Will Confucianism, Brahmanism, Buddhism, or Taoism meet the needs of an enlightened mind so as to give "the hope that maketh not ashamed?" Will the absurd, not to say cruel, teaching of Mahomet or the more unreasonable and wicked enormities of Mormonism command the credence of logical thinkers? This writer will not insult an educated mind by supposing any other than a negative reply. Reference to a good dictionary is all that is needed to show that the few grains of truth found in each erratic system is so mixed up with error as to make the doctrine too absurd for human acceptance when thinking is freed from fanatic bonds.

Can the vagaries of false theories whose authors are now living in free America be for a moment dominant among men whose "science" is constant proof of error in those who contradict mental laws? The greatest mystery attached to the history of the isms that afflict parts of our country is the fact that dupes enough have been found to constitute a colony or congregation. The millions of dollars of which the poor have been robbed to fill the coffers of designing leaders should long ago have shown the motives governing the so-called rulers.

Consciousness is that which makes a man know the feelings of mind or body. It is "the known" in every sentient being. That there should be a vagary denying consciousness yet giving votaries enough to enrich a false teacher is by no means complimentary to this age. The man or the woman who says there is no knowledge of pain should also declare ignorance



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

of the thought or language as to the knowledge of no knowledge.

No student of truth can be deceived by mere nonsense. Hence there is no necessity for refuting a self-destructive "cult," but mention may be made of "dupes" to show the duty of men to accept and circulate the teachings of Omniscience to rescue those consenting to be dupes. Really it sometimes seems true that the more unreasonable or nonsensical a theory may be the more readily is a sort of following obtained from that class of human beings who desire to be rid of the obligations involved in moral truth. But the men whom we have named as "scientific," though neglecting religion, cannot be thought of as accepting the delusive "cults" mentioned.

To these scholars the question is given: Can true science ever admit atheism? So far as investigation has gone in mind or matter, there is no known department of knowledge void of proofs of Deity and, we may add, of designing Deity. With equal confidence we may point to proved words proclaiming divine law and the plan of salvation—those words coming from the Creator.

Can a thinker consistently ignore his high privilege of happiness in accepting the ultimate of all real science? Common sense is forced to give a negative.

There are, however, two phases of supposedly thinking men that should not be unnoticed in this "conclusion" of a search for truth. They are not of the class of professed neglecters. They, on the contrary, claim to be ardently desirous for the abolition of all error. Entirely unlike in modes of so-called

## *Recapitulation.*

reasoning, they agree in the supposition that knowledge of God is prohibited to the average man. They both claim ignorance to be the *ultima thule* of man's mental journeying. The one declares that men cannot know, the other that man ought not to know, God's declaration of himself. The one lauds science as not leading to devotion; the other has somehow caused the circulation of the dictum, "Ignorance is the mother of devotion."

The really gifted men who gave currency to the word "agnostic" have had ample justice done them by the scholars of the nineteenth century. Giving all credit to them for their investigations in the world of life, learned Christian thinkers have wondered at the declaration that knowledge was not where knowledge was evident. If Bushnell was correct when he said, "Matter is not more evident than the mind that shapes it," the agnosticism that denies knowledge of the Shaper is indeed a wonderful inconsistency. Like pioneers who, with a toiling genius, blaze a way through thick forests to arable lands, yet turn back to tell succeeding travelers that no such lands are known, although the blazing certainly leads to cultivatable fields, agnostic scientists give facts of life evidently showing that God holds in his own hands the life-giving energy, but these "blazers" deny knowledge of that great Jehovah.

Letting the originators of the term "agnostic" pass with what has been said, we come to deal with a very harmful phase of pulpit or literary deliverance in recent years, which perhaps may influence many persons away from the peace to be found in the faith that

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

gives spiritual victory. That pulpit or that editorial chair professing to be religious, yet infusing doubt into the mind as to the miracles recorded in the New Testament, must be placed in the ranks of Christ's opponents. The agnosticism that declares a knowledge of goodness in the Nazarene because he is the author of the Sermon on the Mount, but denies his authority when he gave the order, "Lazarus, come forth," is as far removed from consistency as was the reported author of the words, "Crush the wretch."

Human intellect is incompetent even to imagine how goodness can be inherent in the person who willfully endeavors to impose a deception upon the human race. Character cannot be good and bad at the same time and in reference to the same thing. No judge or jury would say the testimony of a witness was reliable when an arrant falsehood had been proved upon that witness in regard to the very thing on which the same witness proposed to give evidence. *Falsus in uno, falsus in omnibus* ("False in one, false in all") seems a wise decision of the judicial mind. Yet in an enlightened age we read of pulpit and press trying to make the mind of man take in the thought that Christ was truthful as to goodness but false as to his claims when he said: "Before Abraham was, I am." Alas that there is refusal to see absurdity!

The misfortune of a large part of the reading public is found in the fact that so many literary men first gain influence by real scholarship, and afterwards give evidence of a sad departure from the logic of truth. Few men can measure the injury done to the masses of humanity by erroneous declarations from men of

## *Recapitulation.*

known able attainments. A fame for learning is undoubtedly a power for weal or woe. Even glaring inconsistencies have been foisted upon the credence of some simply because they seemed by the authority of men reputed for learned investigation. A sneer from an occupant of a high philosophic chair has often driven honest souls to the verge of despair.

A good pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Danville, Va., once remarked to this humble scribe: "It is very important for Dr. D— to be right." Two views of this remark are possible. One is that Dr. D— would never change even if error were positively proved; the other is that his large influence made it important for his ideas to be right. In either case the injury arising from an error in an influential genius must be apparent.

On this account the exhortation, "Prove all things, hold fast that which is good," is of great value. If it is possible to know the revelations of "science," it is possible to know enough of God to show duty to God. There could be no science if there were no author thereof.

These thoughts suggest another danger of men "in high places." Carelessness in the use of words constitutes a very regrettable fact sometimes. An incident may illustrate. The editor of a very widely circulated periodical in New York City delivered a lecture or sermon to the students of the great college. In that lecture, as reported, the language was used: "I do not believe in a great first cause." Afterwards the preacher stated something like the following—viz.: "I believe, as Herbert Spencer says, that there is an

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

all-pervading powerful energy from which all things proceed." What mental microscope could distinguish a difference between "a first great cause" and "great energy from which all things proceed," was not revealed to the students; nor has the world been informed how many persons were induced by the first saying to believe the speaker to be inclined to skepticism next of kin to atheism. Equally unknown must be the reason adopted by a *doctor divinitis* for using language which so plainly contradicted his own title of D.D. No doubt there was a meaning which the speaker had in his mind equivalent to saying that he did not believe in an absentee God, a great first cause that deserted the things caused. In other words, he recognized the immanence of God, but chose to call the Deity by the name of energy. There was, however, an unwarrantable carelessness as to the use of words which may have done great harm. What reason could be given for objecting even in appearance to the phrase: "Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth?"

The other phase of supposedly educated thinking is that which seems to teach that the Bible should not be allowed to the masses of men. The claim set up by a professed hierarchy seems to be that a privileged few have authority to say to the multitude: "We greatly blame the agnosticism of Huxley, Spencer, and their followers, but we command you to be agnostic in regard to God's word except in so far as you can get knowledge from *our* lips or from *our* writing." Hence the language of a priest to the effect that the priesthood did prohibit the Bible as

## *Recapitulation.*

printed by Protestants but not the Bible with Catholic notes. The Douay Bible has the notes approved by archbishops, and hence it is not opposed by the priesthood. The Authorized Version of King James and the American Revised Version have no such notes, and therefore are objectionable to the priests. The injunction of the Saviour to "Search the scriptures" is thus ignored, and plainly the word of a human being opposes the command of that human being's Creator. The fundamental error of Catholicism is here illustrated: it is that the word of the Pope is placed above the word of God in authority.

The supremacy of St. Peter over the other disciples seems positively prohibited by the text of the Douay Bible; yet here in America the Church witnesses the fact of a claimant to supremacy because of being the successor of St. Peter! If Peter had been supreme over his brethren, there is not (so far as the most careful study of history can give) a scintilla of proof that he had a successor; but so far from this being true, the positive language of Jesus is prohibitory of all such supremacy.

The folly of the claim would seem to be sufficient guarantee of safety to the American citizen from any danger to his liberty of conscience or to his civil privileges, were it not for the fact that this is a country in which votes govern, and all the persons of the male sex who accept the papal dogma have votes actual or prospective. Danger is not microscopic when this fact is put alongside of the expressed claims of Cardinal Manning, when he puts the following words into the Pope's mouth—viz.: "I acknowledge

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

no civil power; I am the subject of no prince. And I claim more than this: I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men—of the peasant that tills the fields and of the prince that sits upon the throne; of the household that lives in the shade of privacy and the legislator that makes laws for the kingdoms. I am the sole, last, supreme judge of what is 'right' and 'wrong.' ” (See Josiah Strong, “Our Country,” p. 53.)

The same authority, Josiah Strong, gives the following—viz.: “Of the utter degradation of reason and the stifling of conscience the teaching of Cardinal Bellarmine affords good example: If the Pope should err by enjoining vices and forbidding virtues, the Church would be obliged to believe vices to be good and virtues to be bad unless it would sin against conscience.” (“Our Country,” p. 53.)

One can hardly believe that educated citizens regarded as Roman Catholics and respected by their fellow-citizens can really entertain such absurdities; and herein may be the basis of hope for the safety of America's great boon—civil and religious freedom. But that charitable thought will not drive away the idea of danger to mental and moral progress, as well as to the very life of purity in the pulpits in our land, should the papal chair be again occupied by men as bad as those that disgraced its history in the ages gone.

The duty of an evangelical Church is exceedingly plain. It can be no less than that of constantly increasing vigilance for the adoption of every possible means to carry the gospel to the poor and to the

## *Recapitulation.*

rich, and to place a copy of the Holy Bible in every home that can possibly be made accessible to the messengers of truth. Certainly heralds of the cross should not fail to make plain a refutation of the assertion that an honest translation from the original Scriptures without papal notes is not the true Bible.

From all the teachings of science and history—from the investigations of the most painstaking men, agnostic and other; from real searchers for truth as to mind and matter, the honesty of whom cannot be doubted—the following propositions must take rank as truths—viz.:

(a) Motion with design, plainly seen in every department of the material universe, compels the acknowledgment of Jehovah as Creator; while the unity of purpose in all the known laws of that universe must establish the idea of unity. There can be only one Omnipotent God.

(b) A manifestation of the divine authorship of words, constituting a revelation from God to man, must be by the accompaniment of a deed not possible to any other than an omnipotent ruler. Such a deed is the resurrection of Christ, and such deeds are the works of Jesus to which he appealed for the truth of his sayings. Such also attended the giving of moral law.

(c) History may be taken as certainly true when given by eyewitnesses of the events, provided there is no possible doubt as to the veracity of said witnesses; the veracity of witnesses cannot be doubted if there are material and mental memorials *now* observable by men, which memorials could not possibly have



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

been foisted upon humanity by an impostor. Such memorials are claimed for the history of the life, death, and resurrection of the Son of God.

(*d*) Rulership over nature as well as parentage of nature (which is something born) must be thoroughly shown by the Being that acts in raising the dead and in rising from the dead himself. Hence there must be truth in the testimony of St. John when he said: "Without him was not anything made that was made."

(*e*) The fact that life, vegetable or animal, can never be produced by other than the original Creator, coupled with the known truth that life is constantly beginning in both departments of vitality, proves God's presence the same as at the first starting of vital functions.

(*f*) The beginning of consciousness or mind life is positive in its teaching of God as the starter of mental powers.

(*g*) The Giver of the plan of salvation, the Author of that plan, the Giver of physical and mental life, and the Parent of nature, all proved to be one and the same entity, must make it plain that consistent rationality in man gives imperativeness to the acceptance of God's offers by the commanded faith. The fact of the triumphant ascension of the crucified Christ is sufficient proof of the entity named.

(*h*) The requirement of penitence and faith to be exercised by the beneficiary of the gospel plan is reasonable and right, because character as to moral virtue is the object to be attained and willingness is requisite for virtue.

The appeal to men of thought is made on the

## *Recapitulation.*

ground of rational power to choose between right and wrong. The act of penitence and the human part of what is called faith must be acts of human volition, the same as there is volition in the faith exercised in the planting of seed, etc. The following lines from an unknown author show how man has faith:

THERE IS NO UNBELIEF.

There is no unbelief;  
Whoever plants a seed beneath the sod  
And waits to see it push away the clod,  
He trusts in God.

Whoever says, when clouds are in the sky,  
"Be patient, heart; light breaketh by and by,"  
Trusts the Most High.

Whoever sees, 'neath winter's fields of snow,  
The silent harvest of the future grow,  
God's power must know.

Whoever lies down on his couch to sleep,  
Content to lock each sense in slumber deep,  
Knows God will keep.

Whoever says, "To-morrow," "The Unknown,"  
"The future," trusts that Power alone  
He dares disown.

The heart that looks on when the eyelids close,  
And dares to live when life has only woes,  
God's comfort knows.

There is no unbelief;  
And day by day, and night, unconsciously,  
The heart lives by that faith the lips deny.  
God knoweth why.

If it be shown that the Originator of natural law  
is the Giver of revelation which has come to us in a

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

faithful translation into English, we are warranted in making the most earnest appeals to thinking men for a careful study of that Book, as from it and from it alone must come the knowledge that "maketh wise unto salvation." Hence the request for perusal of the following sermon.

"SO THEN FAITH COMETH BY HEARING, AND HEARING BY THE WORD OF GOD." (Rom. x. 17.)

Perhaps no principle has importance more generally acknowledged than the one involved in this text. Every political canvass, every advertising sheet, every shrewd salesman, every practiced auctioneer, is corroborative of the importance men attach to the fact of giving publicity to what they wish men to receive as true.

The immense sums of money expended in employing canvassers in election campaigns; the eagerness each party exhibits to know and to counteract the assertions of its opponents and the manifest anxiety to have the *last* interview with the specimen of sovereignty, the voter—all these things go to show the deep persuasion of our race that "faith cometh by hearing." The real importance of the principle is no less apparent than its universal recognition.

It takes very little meditation upon the history and condition of our world, political or ecclesiastic, to show the thoughtful that our race is very much as its hearing makes it. Why were so many multitudes led to slaughter in the fanatic crusades, in which the most honorable phases of human character seemed entirely forgotten in a zeal (as blind as it was false) to rescue

## Recapitulation.

Jerusalem from Turkish error by the substitution of one equally wicked, though claiming the holy name of "Christianity?" We can only reply: "Their faith came by hearing the earnest but wild harangues of Peter the Hermit, and action followed faith." If we ask why so strong a hold is had upon so much of human society by systems of religion as destitute of piety as of good sense, we will be forced to the admission that peculiarity of education has been the source of power, and education was by hearing.

When children have heard nothing but the teachings of heathenism from their earliest mental dawn, it is hardly wonderful that they should grow up to be idolators. When from the cradle to maturity a person has heard nothing but a constant reiteration of "Ave Marias" and "Te Deums" with constant declarations of the Pope's authority and the infallibility of the Church, is it to be wondered at that he should be a devotee of Catholicism?

The proposition for our study from this line of remark is that *human duty can never be performed without a careful study of God's Word.*

(a) Our mind is first directed, in an attempted elucidation of this theme, to what we consider a just exegesis of the text. We regard it both general and particular in its philosophy. It seems to admit that what is constantly impressed upon the mind through the senses will go very far in determining faith; it also particularizes and asserts the means of that *kind* of hearing which will bring saving faith. *Some kind* of faith may be the result of *any* kind of hearing, but *saving* faith must come from God's Word *only.*

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

In general, man's credence is influenced by something heard—a report—*preaching*. The particular thing to be heard in order to saving faith is that which the word of our Creator imparts. From no other source can the requisite information be obtained for man's release from sin and sorrow.

The apostle is engaged in an argument to show that the way of life and salvation has been opened to all mankind. He had supposed and refuted objections to this feature of the gospel of grace—objections arising from the peculiarity of Jewish prejudice against the Gentiles. One of those objections was that from the system of salvation by faith (which Paul so earnestly proclaimed) men would be held responsible for things over which they have no control. "You say men must call upon the name of the Lord. How can they call upon him of whom they have not heard? To call, they must believe; to believe, they must hear; to hear, they must have something to hear. Now has "the word" been sent them? The apostle admits the justness of the conclusion if the premises be granted, but denies the assertion that made up the minor premise—viz., that the word of God was not given in sufficient measure for saving faith. Faith does come by hearing, and the thing to be heard is the gospel; but, I say, have they not heard? What persons are those we blame? Are they not those who have had opportunities but have failed to improve them? Who have heard, but not *obediently* heard, the news of salvation?

At the time the text was written (A.D. 57) the gospel had been proclaimed in Judea, Syria, Asia

## Recapitulation.

Minor, Greece, Rome, Arabia, and in the Mediterranean Islands.

Paul reasoning before Agrippa said he (Agrippa) could not be ignorant of these things; they had not been done in a corner. There was enough "report" of the doings of Christ and his disciples to demand careful investigation of the claims involved. Refusing such investigation and going on in the beaten track of error was to refuse to hear the word and hence to be responsible for the *kind* of faith. The proposition of the text as to duty would apply to all those places visited by the apostles and to whom the good news had come. They could have had faith by a proper use of their possible information.

We need not perplex ourselves about the responsibilities of the ignorant ones who died at a time previous to the reception of the gospel. We may safely trust such cases in the hands of a just and merciful Judge. We may feel confident in the wisdom of the Originator of the plan, and say that he will allow those to be lost *only* who violate his will.

We may, with equal confidence, assert that the greatest criminality exists in men who voluntarily refuse to make use of possible means of knowing what must be done to become obedient servants and hence heirs of God.

(b) This exegesis being taken as true, we are led to remark upon the responsibilities and blessings of Christian hearers in our own times. If faith comes by hearing, we may certainly suppose the *kind* of faith is dependent upon the *kind* of hearing. The exhortation of Jesus, "Take heed *how* ye hear," was

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

never more important than at the present period of the world's history. Religion is frequently endangered by her own instrumentalities—*i. e.*, those developments which must be used for the spread of truth, those exercises which must be employed to give facility to hearing, are frequently used to sap the very foundations of piety and thus allow the devil to triumph in the very temple of the Lord.

In nothing is this more clearly seen than in the use of intellectual power. How much of it is employed against the service of the soul's Author! How often is knowledge made to pander to pride or unholy ambition! The use many make of their mental advantages is like the action of the architect who has gone through a long course of training in studying the principles upon which beauty and comfort depend in a building; but when he comes to build his own home he employs his knowledge to produce discomfort and ugliness. It is like the action of the maniac harvester who, gifted with scythe and cradle, goes into the green Indian corn rather than into the golden wheat to try his blade. It is like the skilled marksman who makes the heart of his own loved child the target for practice, or as the druggist who employs knowledge of pharmacy to defeat the physician's prescription. It is as if merchants in a town should endeavor to destroy every crop of the farmer whose patronage is necessary to trade. In a word, the development of man's mind is but too frequently made the cause of harm to himself. It is always the case when the end and aim of hearing or of investigating truth (the word of God is truth) is not one of benefit in the

## *Recapitulation.*

sense of getting ready to die and of inducing others to do the same. Whenever men listen to the gospel or engage in an examination of revealed truth merely to have an opportunity afterwards to exhibit smartness in criticism or to gratify the love of entertainment without profit; to be able to point out how far their neighbors are from consistency, but not to bring the gospel microscope to an examination of their own spiritual condition at all—whenever any or all of these constitute the object of hearing and the hearer ignores the simple teaching, “A charge to keep I have,” etc., we must look upon the exercise as one not producing the faith that purifies the heart and hence saves the soul. Such misuse of culture is much to be deplored. We are responsible for the result of Jehovah’s gifts to our soul.

Let it be our aim to examine our own hearts first, subject our own conduct first to the crucible of analysis; and then we may look at that of others, provided our aim be to do good.

The abuse of culture is, however, no argument against culture itself. The wrong use of thinking is no reason for abandonment of thought. True religion must always foster genuine education.

Because men have used water to prepare poison is no reason for discarding it as a solvent of medicine or as a means to secure the value of tea or coffee. Nothing can be farther from wisdom than to argue that because developed brains have sometimes yielded to depravity, and hence have done harm, therefore “Ignorance is the mother of devotion.” It is the misuse we deplore.



## *Douay or New York, Which?*

“Who learns and learns, but acts not what he knows,  
Is one who plows and plows, but never sows.”

(c) Having shown what we thought the proper meaning of the source whence faith may arise and alluded to the duty of *right* hearing that we may have *right* faith, let us call to mind some of the blessings to be expected from meeting the responsibilities in question.

(1) The removal of uncertainty.

Is there any certainty of result from human investigations? Can man settle the question of his future condition? If this be possible, no language can fitly portray the blessings in such provision. One of the greatest discomforts to our race is that which arises from doubt and uncertainty. It is indeed a great source of comfort to have a basis upon which faith may rest without any fear of fatal disaster. Now our gracious Redeemer has so ordered the economy of his great scheme as to put within man's reach the regaining of what was lost by transgression.

The giving of this boon was as unmerited on our part as it was purely gracious on God's part; but when once offered by divine mercy, there was as much certainty about it as about any other provision of the same great Ruler.

It is not presumption, then, for man to claim good results from the commanded use of revelation. Only let him rightly hear—*i. e.*, reverently obey the law of the gospel—and he may as legitimately expect the fulfillment of the promises attached thereto as Adam could look for the smiles of the Creator so long as obedience marked the history of Eden. Why not?

## *Recapitulation.*

Can Jehovah regard the products of his power more than the products of his love? Can he look upon a less work with more complacency than upon a greater? Can he have more regard for that which cost the exertion of creative power than for that which cost the blood of his incarnate Son? that Son, too, having become incarnate for the special purpose of redemption? Away with the idea that the divine Planner does not want his own plan to succeed!

Love would be defective if this idea were true. Divine wisdom and power were sufficient to produce the wonders of creation; divine love and mercy were competent to make the atonement, and this the Great One looks upon as the greatest act of his great government.

“Could we with ink the ocean fill,  
Were the whole world of parchment made,  
Were every single stick a quill,  
Were every man a scribe by trade—  
To write the love of God alone  
Would drain the ocean dry,  
Nor would the scroll contain the whole  
Though stretched from sky to sky.”

Why should it ever enter the mind that such love can fail? Why should any one doubt of welcome to the arms of such a Benefactor—such a loving Father? Depend upon it, my brethren, there is no uncertainty in the great heart of the King of kings in regard to how he shall treat a returning prodigal.

Those persons, therefore, do greatly err who suppose that faith is the gift of God in the sense of arbitrariness—that each person must fold his arms in inactivity and wait for an overwhelming impulse

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

to compel faith in God. We know there have been times when the command was to "stand still and see the salvation of God." But they were times when action of the human being had gone as far as it was possible for it to go. It is also true that as soon as the way of further action was opened human will was again called upon. The most striking instance is found in the "exodus" from Egypt.

Moses does order the people to stand still, but it is only *when* they had done what they could until the highway was made. The work of salvation was to make the road, to wall up the waters, not to do the walking for Israel. So in regard to this whole matter of securing the blessings of faith. The way is provided, the word is given; man must hear the word and walk in the way. We can if we will investigate divine truth so as to provide credence in its declarations. This investigation is voluntary on our part. Hence we reach the conclusion that there is a certainty of our attaining saving faith by a proper use of the Saviour's gifts just as there was a certainty of Israel's deliverance by walking the prepared highway. With joy the preacher can lift his voice and proclaim: "Whosoever will, let him partake," etc.

If an honest searcher after truth comes to the herald of the cross and makes inquiry as to the problem of salvation—seeks to know whether the heavenly scribe is authorized to enroll his name in the book of life—let not the herald try to unveil the courts of the celestial kingdom in order to see the actual writings; let him not try to go back in the history of divine jurisprudence to see if the name was by decree

## *Recapitulation.*

put upon the list of predestined favorites; let him not ask what foreknowledge has put down as prophecy in the case. O let him not cause the already doubting soul to tremble afresh by an unholy "perhaps" as to what will be done with the sincere penitent. Let him rather ask: "What's the state of your own will, my brother? Which do you choose, a life of obedience or a life of religious unconcern?" There need be no doubt as to the action of God. Suppose I have in my hand a purse of gold, and it is to be yours if it obeys the law of attraction and falls when released from my hand. Would you have doubt if you see it start from my hand? Would you for a moment suppose it would go upward? God is as faithful in grace as in nature.

"We drive the furrow of the share of faith  
Through the waste fields of life, and our own hands  
Sow thick the seeds that spring to weeds or flowers;  
And never strong necessity or fate  
Trammels the soul that firmly says: "I will."  
Else are we playthings, and  
'Tis Satan's mock to preach to us repentance and belief."

(2) Happiness in the means of grace is a blessed result of this faith. The service of the sanctuary—the study of revelation—the preaching of salvation will all have new attractions for us. Men will not repair to the place of prayer and praise like whipped children to repulsive tasks. The Psalmist said: "I was glad when they said unto me, Let us go into the house of the Lord." Why this? Was it because he could there better display his royal dress and receive the adulation of vain courtiers? Not at all. It was because he could there better meditate upon his duty

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

and privilege by hearing God's word. Men do delight in that which promises pleasure. To the true worshiper these are great promises. He takes pleasure in hearing them read over and over and commented on.

Can the conscience of a thinker be at ease in the reflection: "I am a moral agent—God has given means of learning how to meet moral obligation. I must perish if I do not take any steps to secure that learning. The Sabbath day has been instituted. I am not only allowed, but by divine and human law *commanded*, to take one day out of seven from secular business to afford opportunity for reflection upon moral duties. Churches have been built and regular appointments are made, but I make no use of them all?" We say, can the thinker be easy in such reflections? Not to have such reflections makes the evidence of degradation only the greater, for it is saying that the man is passing through life without any inquiry as to the after.

Now if either thoughtlessness or uneasiness must belong to the man who refuses to employ means of grace—means, too, that God has ordained—we perceive how deplorable is his case when the use of such means is a torture to him. Let us rather have pleasure in hearing the word; we will then have no reason for giving excuses for nonattendance. How great a saving this will be to the labor of invention! The brain of many a person has been taxed to find excuses.

(3) But some one may ask, What exertion must I make to attain these great ends? We reply, Bring the mind up to the gospel, not try to bring the gospel

## Recapitulation.

down to the carnal wish of the mind—*i. e.*, do not say: "The gospel must adapt itself to my taste; my taste cannot be adapted to the gospel." Seek what is true and *make it pleasant*, not seek what is pleasant and try to make it true. Much harm has been done in the world by trying to make the Bible prove our preconceived theories true, instead of going to the fountain of truth for a theory. Inclination must not determine criticism upon an exposition or exhortation. Some one wrote:

What use the preacher's truth and earnest exhortation?  
The hearer makes inverted application.  
A miser listened once to a discourse most moving,  
The habit of unstinted charity approving.  
He said: 'I never was so much affected;  
How beautiful is charity when well directed!  
So clear and noble is the duty of almsgiving  
At once I'll go—and beg, as sure as I am living.

Such applications, we fear, are too common.

(4) We are encouraged to urge this effort to attain the faith that comes by hearing in all its valuable purity and without unholy pandering to vitiated taste, by a consideration of the ultimate happiness securable thereby. It is possible for us to enjoy worship here. Religious advice is not always like the bitterness of quinine, which must be endured rather than have a return of the evil it is said to cure. It is rather the palatable cordial prescribed to the convalescent for the purpose of increasing physical strength.

But aside from all this, we appeal to you on account of the ultimate and eternal benefit. Nothing else can meet our wants.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

The sermon of the converted Chinaman will admirably illustrate the great value of the faith that comes by hearing the word of God in contrast with other systems. He said that when he was deeply concerned about his soul he imagined a man fallen into a deep pit.

Confucius said: "If you ever get out, don't get in any more."

Buddhist said: "If you, unaided, scramble two-thirds of the way, I can help you."

The Saviour reached entirely down to the bottom, and asked only that the fallen be willing to rise.

Who will profit by the text?

## APPENDIX.





## APPENDIX.

---

### Note A, for Page 94.

One of the most remarkable things in the history of the Church is that found in the fact that the idea of inflicting pains and penalties for religious opinions was not absent from the persecuted party, so soon as that party became powerful. Queen Elizabeth, though beginning her reign in a way to indicate that she would not retaliate on the Catholics as to the cruelties of her sister Mary, did not continue her honorable policy many years. The Church of England became the persecutor of Nonconformists; Puritans became persecutors of those who would not indorse all the puritanic creed. Even John Calvin can be charged with the same class of error. Gibbon (see history, Vol. V., p. 401) says: "I am more deeply scandalized at the single execution of Servetus than at the hecatombs which have blazed in the *Auto da Fes* of Spain and Portugal. A Catholic inquisitor yields the same obedience which he requires, but Calvin violated the Golden Rule of doing as he would be done by," etc. Protestants of the twentieth century cannot do otherwise than sorrowfully acknowledge and strongly condemn all such deeds. It is sincerely hoped that, by the spread of the influence of Holy Writ given in all the vernaculars of the varied nations, the world will never again be called to witness such antichristian atrocities.

The history of them should be a lesson on the great difficulty of driving away from the human mind an error deep-rooted by long practice. The reformers did not at once banish from their midst all the wrong ideas of the Dark Ages. Even Luther was slow to give up the doctrine of his early years as to "the real presence," etc. Let all true Christians cleave to the original words of Jesus as he evidently intended them to be understood.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

### **Note B, for Page 95.**

"Pope Innocent III. was of the opinion that the Scriptures were too deep for the common people, as they surpassed even the understanding of the wise and learned. Several synods in Gaul during the thirteenth century prohibited the reading of the Romanic translation and ordered the copies to be burned. Archbishop Bethold, of Mainz, in an edict of January 4, 1486, threatened with excommunication all who ventured to translate and to circulate translation of sacred books, especially the Bible, without his permission. The Council of Constance, which burned John Huss and Jerome of Prague, also condemned the writings of Wyclif [the first translation of the whole Bible into the English tongue] to the flames; and Arundel, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of England, denounced him as "that pestilent wretch of damnable heresy who as a complement of his wickedness invented a new translation of the Scriptures into his mother tongue." (See Schaff's "Church History," Vol. VI. p. ?.)

### **Note B<sup>1</sup>, for Page 95.**

Lord Macaulay says: "When the barbarians overran the Western empire to the time of the revival of letters, the influence of the Church of Rome had been generally favorable to science, to civilization, and to good government. But during the last three centuries, to stunt the growth of the human mind has been her chief object. Throughout Christendom whatever advance has been made in knowledge, in freedom, in wealth, and in the arts of life has been made in spite of her, and has everywhere been in inverse proportion to her power. The loveliest and most fertile provinces of Europe have, under her rule, been sunk in poverty, in political servitude, and in intellectual power! which Protestant countries once proverbial for sterility and barbarism have been turned by skill and industry into gardens, and can boast of a long list of heroes and statesmen, philosophers, and poets." ("History of England," Vol. I., p. 36.)

## Appendix.

### Note C, for Page 96.

That the morals of Europe were not misrepresented by the historians, and that the Church authorities were seemingly opposed to any thorough reform, may be clearly seen from the testimony of the highest class of Roman Catholics. Pope Adrian VI., a man represented as of stern integrity, confessed that corruption of ecclesiastics to the Diet of Nuremberg in 1522, and his efforts to reform his court were in vain. At his death, the physician that attended the sick man was in a very significant manner honored as a friend to surviving members of the Vatican household. (See "Church History," by Ruter, pp. 299-310.)

The call for the Council of Trent (1542 A.D.) and the well-authenticated history, given by Roman Catholics, of that celebrated body, must be considered as tending to the same kind of proof. The call was, as shown by the "Bull of Confirmation" from Pope Pius IV., "for extirpating many and most pernicious heresies, for correcting the morals and for restoring the discipline of the Church" (*ad plurimas et perniciosissimas extirpendas, ad corrigandas mores et restituendam ecclesiasticam disciplinam*). The history of the sessions can show no improvement as to morals or doctrine, but a vast departure from the Nicene creed, which creed was read at the beginning of the deliberations as that to which the Church should adhere. Especially was it remarkable, that there was an index of prohibited books and an approval of those most objectionable practices which had caused the uprising of so large a part of the German and English people. Nothing, perhaps, had so contributed to the vice of the age as the doctrine of indulgence, and yet the Council of Trent formally approved of it.

Thus it is shown that the call proved the need of the distribution of God's Word for moral improvement, the acts of the assembly acting under that call proved an unwillingness for the adoption of real reform. This occurring so short a time before the translation at Rheims could hardly do otherwise than give force to the criticism of the thinker we have supposed.

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

### **Note D, for Page 103.**

For over three hundred years after Peter's sermon on Pentecost, the Church officers seemed to follow Peter's example in taking only such duties as were requisite for a Church organization to carry out Christ's orders "go," "preach," etc.

The Council of Nice (A.D. 325) gave no evidence of regarding the bishops of Rome as having authority over the other bishops. The pages of Eusebius, who wrote about that time, have been searched by the writer of this paper, in vain so far as finding that idea is concerned. The duty of presiding in convocations was imposed upon officers from Cesarea, Jerusalem, and other places; but the Roman officer we do not find. Even Constantine did not assume such authority over the Church as was in after years claimed by the occupant of the papal chair.

The delivery of the keys could by possibility give no more to Peter than the same delivery to the other apostles gave to each of them. The use of metaphor here is as plain as in the case of the rock. The key of knowledge meant what? Evidently the knowledge of the plan of salvation was that to which Jesus alluded. The commission to preach or tell that plan was to all the witnesses of Christ's ascension. Peter was not present when Philip explained the plan to the Ethiopian, nor did Paul consult Peter in reference to his varied speeches. That the keys were used by *all* the preachers of the gospel in apostolic times can be explained on no other ground than that they had received those keys from proper authority.

### **Note E, for Page 108.**

The word "prevent" is used in the fifty-ninth Psalm and in many other places in the Authorized Version to mean "help," "aid," or "assist." Modern dictionaries and common usage make it mean "to check," "hinder," "restrain." Hence the revisers gave words that must be competent to give the meaning of the original in the English of the present age. So with the word "let" modern usage has given the idea of

## Appendix.

"permitting" or "allowing." The version of 1611 used "let" in two meanings very nearly opposite. "Let him that heareth say come" has the meaning of "allow." But St. Paul is represented as saying, "I was let hitherto," when the original evidently meant "hindered." The double usage may have belonged to King James's time, but not to the present age. Hence the revision has "hindered" in Romans i. 13. These two instances are types of the revision.

### Note F, for Page 112.

The American Bible Society in the year 1903 sent out from its press 1,993,558 copies of the Authorized Version of 1611. Within the past year the said Society has agreed to print the American Standard Revision of 1901, so that the circulation of the Scriptures in the language of the present generation will be largely facilitated.

As to the value of this latter version, we copy the following: Rev. W. W. Moore, D.D., Professor of Hebrew in Union Theological Seminary, Richmond, Va., says of the American Standard Revision of the English Version of the Bible:

"This is the book of the year. Not only so, it is the book which makes this the red-letter year in the Christian calendar, an *annus memorabilis* in the annals of biblical study and interpretation. We do not think it too much to say that this is the best version of the Scriptures that has ever been made.

"There has been steady improvement in the English Versions from the time of Cædmon (A.D. 650) and his successors.

But this American Revision is by far the most exact and faithful translation, and also the most accurately and beautifully printed Bible that has yet appeared.

"The superiority of this American Revision, in the general make-up and manner of printing and convenience for use in Bible study, is obvious at a glance.

"One of the greatest improvements in convenience for actual use in Bible study is the provision of topical headings

## *Douay or New York, Which?*

and marginal references to parallel and illustrative passages.”  
(From *Union Seminary Magazine*, October, 1901.)

### BIBLIOGRAPHY FOR THE ESSAY “THE WORDS OF JESUS, OUR TEACHER.”

Ecclesiastical History, by Eusebius, translated by Cruse  
(Rev. C. F.), 1839.

Novum Testamentum, Interpreta., Theodore Beza, MDCC-  
XCIII.

Novum Testamentum Græce, Augustus Hahn. American  
Edition, 1845, curante Evardo Robinson, S.T.D.

Novum Testamentum—Græce, Studio et labore, Gulielmi  
Greenfield, 1840. Following Griesbach.

History of the Christian Church, by Schaff, 1895.

A guide to the Study of the Authority of the New Testa-  
ment (Greek), by E. C. Mitchell, 1880.

Hume's History of England, Harpers, 1850.

Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, Gibbon. Philips,  
Sampson, and Co., 1856.

Johnson's Universal Encyclopedia, 1896.

New International Encyclopedia, 1903.

The Holy Bible Douay Version. Approbation of Abp. Gib-  
bons, 1899.

Watson's Institutes, McClintock, 1850.

History of the English People, by John Richard Green,  
Hon. Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford.

Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospel, by Andrew  
Norton, 1871.

American Encyclopedia, 1883, C. A. Dana.

Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia, 1881, Dr. Schaff.

Chambers's Encyclopedia, 1892.

History of England, Macaulay, 1856.

The Revised Version of the Holy Bible, Harper & Broth-  
ers, N. Y., 1885.

The Revised Version by American Committee, T. Nelson  
& Sons, N. Y., 1901.

Ruter's Church History, 1834, N. Y. Carlton & Porter.

## *Appendix.*

The Great Reformation, by Carlos Martyn, American Tract Company, 1867.

Biblia Sacra, Vulgatæ Editionis, Sixti V. Pontificis Max. Iussu Recognita et Clementis VIII. Auctoritate Editæ, Versiculis Distincta et ad Singula Capita Argumentis Aucta, Iudiceque Epistolarum et Evangeliorum locupletata, Venetiis, MDCLXXXVIII., Apud Nicolaum Pezzana.





